DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 417 TM 003 359

TITLE	The Report of the Citizens Commission on Basic Education.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Nov 73
NOTE	201p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Bureau of Publications, Penna. Dept. of Education, Box 911, Harrisburg, Pa. 17126
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	*Citizens Councils; Educational Accountability; Educational Administration; *Educational Finance; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Policy; Educational Responsibility; Public Education; School Services; *State Boards of Education; State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Citizens Commission on Basic Education; Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

The responsibility of the Citizens Commission was to propose recommendations for the improvement of basic education in Pennsylvania. The Commission's recommendations are an attempt to clearly define the boundaries of the schooling process and to increase the effectiveness of the instructional process within those boundaries. The Commission presented recommendations for reforming curricular practices, the organization for instruction, staffing, management, physical facilities, establishing educational policy, instituting accountability, providing supportive services, and financing education. All of the Commission's recommendations are based on the premise that education should be personalized to meet the needs of the student. (NE)

ED 085417

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Report of the Citizens Commission on Basic Education

TM 003 359

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

Milton J. Shapp, Governor

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 085417

The Report of

THE CITIZENS COMMISSION ON BASIC EDUCATION

MILTON J. SHAPP
Governor

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
November, 1973

Funded in part through the Office of Education, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Title IV, Section 402 and Title V-A, Section 503 ESEA.

THE CITIZENS COMMISSION ON BASIC EDUCATION

CO-CHAIRMEN

Ernest P. Kline James H. Rowland, Sr.

MEMBERS

Ruth V. Bennett
Madge K. Benovitz
Harry Block
Peter Buttenwieser
Robert Cavanaugh
Gerri Chizeck
Paul S. Christman
Richard A. deBethizy
R. Budd Dwyer
Arthur Edmunds
Wilmot E. Fleming
Donald W. Fox
Jane S. Freedman
Miriam L. Gafni
James J. A. Gallagher
Emmanuel J. George
Richard G. Gilmore
John O. Hershey
William C. Heyn
Max H. Homer
H. Ronald Huber
Edward T. Hughes
Donald E. Hunter
Victoria Johnson
Pauline Leet
W. Deming Lewis
K. Frederick Mauger
Hugh F. McKeegan
Henry C. Messinger
Richard A. Mix
Joseph V. Oravitz
G. Sieber Pancoast
Joseph M. Plevyak
William M. Potter
Donald Rappaport
A. Wayne Readinger
Jeanette F. Reibman
William R. Riekert
Louise F. Scholze
Fred Speaker, Jr.
Wayne Walker
Bernard C. Watson
Raymond B. Wittig*

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Donald M. Carroll, Jr.

CHIEF OF STAFF

John L. Kennedy

STAFF

Joseph F. Bard
John Billman
Jeanne Boydston
Kathy Eberly
Galen Godbey
Robert Lewis
George D. Sauers
Gerry Woods
Ann Woolridge

Richard Gibboney, Consultant

* Deceased

GOVERNOR'S CHARGE
TO
THE CITIZENS COMMISSION ON BASIC EDUCATION

July 17, 1972

Dear Commissioners:

As I said in my inaugural address, this administration—in spirit and in action—will be the people's advocate in the Legislature, in the courts and before the boards, commissions and agencies which regulate our social and economic life.

The Citizens Commission on Basic Education should seek ways to improve the quality of education as well as look at ways the rising costs of education can be held down. What is wrong with our system of education? What keeps us tied to twelve years of schooling with 180 days of school per year? Why does a tax dollar buy less education for a child in one school district than it does in another? Are our schools, as Charles Silberman has termed them, "joyless"?

Our educators and institutions of learning are a great source of pride to me but the time has passed when we can say that schools are doing their job simply because they continue to stay open. It is a matter of high priority to me that we find ways to make education more responsive to the needs of its consumers—the children, parents and communities of the Commonwealth.

MILTON J. SHAPP
Governor

Citizens Commission on Basic Education

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

November 27, 1973

The Honorable Milton J. Shapp
Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Dear Governor Shapp:

Herein we present to you the final report of the Citizens Commission on Basic Education.

When you convened the Citizens Commission in July, 1972, you charged it with the responsibility of examining and making recommendations for the improvement of the quality of education in Pennsylvania.

The Commission carried on this work in monthly meetings, both in general session and in seven committees: Curriculum, Organization for Instruction, Staffing, Management, Supportive Services, Governance and Finance. As well as drawing on the specialized knowledge of numerous educational authorities, the Commission relied heavily on the practical wisdom of the general public and the extensive first-hand experience of the Commissioners themselves through formal discussions and interviews, three sets of public hearings held at various sites throughout the Commonwealth and careful examination of professional educational literature.

The challenges which face public education today are serious indeed. We must take steps to meet more fully the needs of students of all races and cultural backgrounds, of both sexes and of different learning abilities. Failure in this task may impair the full development of our citizens, both individually and collectively.

The Citizens Commission has tried to work faithfully and realistically to strengthen public education in the Commonwealth. We earnestly solicit your support—and that of all Pennsylvanians—in pursuit of this vital goal.

Sincerely yours,

Ernest P. Kline, Co-chairman

James H. Rowland, Sr., Co-chairman

THE REPORT OF THE CITIZENS COMMISSION ON BASIC EDUCATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. THE COMMONWEALTH'S ROLE IN BASIC EDUCATION 1

II. COMMISSION OVERVIEW 3

III. COMMISSION PERSPECTIVE 9

IV. CURRICULUM 15

V. ORGANIZATION FOR INSTRUCTION 33

VI. STAFFING 55

VII. MANAGEMENT 77

VIII. GOVERNANCE 93

IX. SUPPORTIVE SERVICES 117

X. FINANCE 135

APPENDIX (MINORITY REPORTS) 159

GLOSSARY 186

BIBLIOGRAPHY 188

INDEX 192

MEMORIAL 197

Additional copies of this report, as well as biographical sketches of the Commissioners, may be obtained by writing:

THE BUREAU OF PUBLICATIONS
PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
BOX 911
HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA 17126

Chapter I

The Commonwealth's Role In Basic Education

The Governor's appointment of a Citizens Commission on Basic Education reflects Pennsylvania's historic commitment to the principle that the education of its children is a proper and legitimate concern of the Commonwealth. It is the constitutional obligation of the Commonwealth, and in its best interest, to guarantee every child a quality education.

The value of an enlightened citizenry was early recognized by William Penn, whose colonial charter gave the Governor and the Provincial Council power to "erect and order all public schools." This attitude was later exhibited in Pennsylvania's provisional constitution of 1776, which gave the legislature the responsibility of supporting public schools in every county. Until 1834, however, the purpose of common schools was only to provide instruction for the sons and daughters of poor families. By opening the way for a statewide educational system intended to serve all children, the Free School Act of 1834 became the landmark in the evolution of free and genuinely public schools. In reporting the bill out of committee, the Joint Committee on Education called for "an educational association between the rich, the comparatively rich and the destitute." In supporting this legislation, Thaddeus Stephens described the Commonwealth's interest in education:

> If . . . the permanency of our government depends upon . . . knowledge, it is the duty of government to see that the means of information be diffused to every citizen. This is sufficient answer to those who deem education a private and not a public duty . . .

Article III of the present Pennsylvania Constitution reaffirms this traditional respect for formal instruction and its contribution to the public welfare by declaring that:

> The General Assembly shall provide for the maintenance and support of a thorough and efficient system of public education to serve the needs of the Commonwealth.

The General Assembly, while continuing to exercise its authority directly in such areas as school finance, nevertheless has delegated certain aspects of its authority, thereby creating our present educational

hierarchy. The State Board of Education, the Secretary of Education, local* boards of school directors, and local school administrators are involved in the development, administration and evaluation of educational policy, with the intermediate units providing educational services at the request of their constituent districts. Although these groups have important roles to play in the creation and maintenance of high quality educational opportunities, constitutional authority nonetheless remains with the General Assembly.

The fate of public education, however, ultimately lies with the private citizens of the Commonwealth. The ability to choose wisely among candidates for public office, the willingness to make material sacrifices, the involvement in schools at the local level, and the continuing pursuit of personal educational goals is the ground on which a solid education system is built.

---

* Since school boards exist only on the local level, technically, the phrase "local school board" is a redundancy. However, for purposes of clarity, the Commission has used the adjective "local."

Chapter II

Commission Overview

Because of the length of its report, the Commission has chosen to include, in these pages, a summary statement in which the major themes of the Commission's work are set forth.

The charge of this Commission was to propose recommendations for the improvement of basic education in Pennsylvania. In the course of its 18-month study, however, the nature of that task frequently carried the Commission into significant areas of concern far beyond the immediate range of its charge.

Education embraces life, and schools necessarily bear the imprint of the world—its promises as well as its problems. The transformation of the American family, for example, may presage either the greater fulfillment of individuals or deep social chaos. In either case, the impact on education is and will continue to be profound. Such an issue is too large for this, or perhaps any, Commission to deal with definitively. The Commission has been forced to make difficult decisions about what it can reasonably hope to influence—and what schools can reasonably hope to accomplish.

Thus, in making its recommendations, the Commission had to resist the idea that the schools can solve all the problems of society. Schooling is only a part of the educational process: most learning does and should occur beyond the walls of the school building.

* * *

The Commission's recommendations are an attempt to define more clearly the boundaries of the schooling process and to increase the effectiveness of the instructional process within those limits. Schools cannot bear primary responsibility for meeting all the needs of children; thus, the Commission has recommended that Commonwealth agencies other than the Department of Education assume a major portion of this responsibility, e.g., health and transportation programs. Neither can schools "produce" educated people the way a factory produces cars or refrigerators. They can, however, create programs and policies which will encourage and give direction to students' life-long learning.

The Commission believes that this goal is achievable only in an educational environment which is committed to the worth of persons rather than systems. The Commission's signal word for this philosophical stance

is "personalization." This concept recognizes that learning is a process of enhancing inherent potential rather than one of gilding the student with facts. Good teaching is this process of enhancing potential, and not merely dispensing information. To be most effective, schools must meet the needs of students. Emphasis should be given to learning: to helping students develop decision-making skills, not to imposing decisions upon them. In large part, personalizing education requires profound changes in the organization and methods of education. The needs of students should never be sacrificed for administrative ease.

The organizational corollary to the philosophical concept of personalization is flexibility. Although the Commonwealth should play a more active role in evaluation, the primary thrust of state regulation in this area should be guiding and facilitative. Within the limits of state regulations, and available financial resources, schools should operate more like libraries than factories. Administrative and instructional patterns must accommodate the differing growth rates and learning styles of students. Neither local nor state policies should tie schools to the 12-year concept of public education. Counselors should be skilled in advising teachers and administrators in designing such programs. The legal definition of the length of the school day and the school year should encourage year-round programs, evening classes and out-of-school experiences. Student progress toward graduation should be measured in terms of actual skills and knowledge acquired—not by the completion of arbitrary numbers of courses or years. This orientation should prevent the mass-packaging and mass-merchandizing of curriculum.

The idea of flexibility is as applicable to the preparation of the people who staff schools as to the programs offered students. The certification process should be open enough to make use of expertise and experience wherever found. Internships for prospective teachers and administrators should be common features of professional development programs. Differentiated staffing, team-teaching and other strategies which capitalize on the individual talents of staff members should be used in schools to help personalize the educational process. The continuation of certification should be dependent upon evidence of continued professional growth. All school employes should participate in self-improvement evaluation programs.

A commitment to personalization requires a commitment to policies which promote equal opportunity. These two concepts are linked by their mutual attention to and respect for the worth of persons. The articulation of student rights and responsibilities, the structuring of curriculum to prevent the arbitrary channeling of students, the strengthening of finance equalization measures and the hiring and promotion

of staff are all areas of policy which should foster equality of opportunity and, through that, the larger goal of personalizing the educational process.

This Commission believes that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, as well as the school districts, has the obligation to promote actively the goal of personalized education. While the Commonwealth has recognized this obligation in the past, its evaluation and accountability procedures have often proved inadequate. As envisioned, the Commonwealth's role in educational accountability should be significantly stronger. It should use such tools as required minimum achievement levels, minimum professional evaluation criteria, and improved long range planning and quality assessment programs to have a more direct influence on the quality of the educational experiences of children. The motive for any accountability measures should always be facilitative rather than punitive: the intent should be to *help* districts overcome their inadequacies, not to punish them. In this way, the concept of accountability becomes a symbol of the cooperative spirit which should characterize the relationships among the various levels of the educational system.

Any system of accountability which is to be genuinely facilitative must draw upon the varied resources available within the local community. For this reason, and because schooling is only one portion—however important—of education, the Commission believes that the interaction between schools and the communities they serve should be maximized. This interaction should be so great that the distinction between school and community eventually fades, with the best resources of each being incorporated into personalized educational programs. Greater citizen participation in school board meetings, the establishment of citizens advisory councils, and the enlisting of citizens as volunteers in the schools are worthwhile tactics for involving citizens. Similarly, schools must employ off-campus sites, organizations and facilities on a regular basis and as integral parts of the instructional program if the separation between school and community is to be overcome. Schools must reduce their distance from the larger world so that students can see more easily the relationship between learning and life and make the difficult transition from formal education to new life experiences.

* * *

Public schools in Pennsylvania currently provide instruction for more than two and one-half million young people. Last year alone, nearly 160,000 young men and women received diplomas. State contributions to local funding are increasing, and districts are moving toward fundamental parity in curricular offerings. Both the Commonwealth and local

boards continue to prescribe more rigorous educational standards for professional staff and facilities and to require that needed services be available to students.

Despite these accomplishments, there are serious shortcomings in the public school system—problems with which the Commission has attempted to deal through its numerous recommendations. The Commission's work is simply the starting point in a change process which may take years to complete. Meaningful change occurs only when the public, together with professional educators, understands the organizational character of schools and appreciates the complexity of the change process. Central to this process is one very obvious feature of the public school system: it constitutes the largest, most intricate network of human relationships in the Commonwealth. This is at once both its greatest strength and its greatest weakness.

School boards and professional employes must spend much time managing potentially unstable external and internal relationships. Large size may result in decreased identification with and loyalty to schools on the part of both students and staff. Teaching and administration lack the mystique of some other professions, such as law and medicine. Strikes by professional school employes have rigidified instructional relationships and alienated some parts of the citizenry. The traditional custodial function of the schools has tended to make them high-control institutions. Administrators, who should be the key agents of change in schools, are often caught between the need for public support and the need for staff support.

Thus, it should not surprise us that, given the number of the school's potentially adversary relationships, schools do not change very quickly. Human beings, whether individually or collectively, tend to examine themselves better in supportive rather than potentially threatening situations.

The result is that the purposes of schools are often ill-defined in the minds of much of the public, and even of the professional educational staff charged with directing the learning process. Few communities have seriously discussed educational philosophy for themselves; needs-assessment programs are often conducted only to satisfy state requirements; and educational objectives, if specified, are often forgotten once the classroom door is shut.

The "mindlessness"* found in many school policies and procedures can only be overcome if schools begin to look at themselves, and if they initiate a continuing dialogue with their communities to ensure common

---

* Charles E. Silberman, *Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education* (New York, 1970), *passim.*

understanding of and agreement with the ends which schools seek to accomplish. School directors, administrators, teachers, students and communities should join efforts in developing personalized instructional programs which they can all understand and support.

Chapter III

Commission Perspective

Education is the acquisition of the art of using knowledge effectively. Knowledge is a means, not an end. It is not enough to know how to get knowledge or even how to use it: knowledge must inform action—education is nothing if it does not serve a variety of human needs.

Education captures meaning from the past, but always faces the future. It is the process by which individuals learn to establish, follow and achieve their personal goals within a social setting, and through which a new generation is enabled to assume social leadership from the passing generation.

The educated person is one in whom the Ten Goals of Quality Education have been realized: a person who knows his or her strengths, weaknesses, preferences and habits; who values membership in society; who understands and appreciates members of different social, cultural, age, sex and ethnic groups; who is a responsible citizen and constructive social critic; who has good health habits; who shows creativity in one or more fields of endeavor; who values work and shows respect for human achievement and who can easily adapt himself or herself to new life conditions.

The Commission recognizes a number of issues which have a direct impact on the child's ability to develop these attributes. The sources of many of these issues are found in the nature of American society itself and do not admit of easy answers. Nevertheless, the Commission believes that it has a responsibility to address these issues.

Equal Educational Opportunity

In a nation as large, transient and diverse as the United States, with its many racial, ethnic, religious, cultural and economic groups, it is crucial that people share certain experiences and goals and that they participate in common institutions and processes.

Public basic education, despite its somewhat varying quality and character, is an important source of social unity. Effective and humane public schools are the key to the further development of a free and civilized society. The Commission strongly reaffirms the need for and value of public education and opposes efforts which would undermine support for the public schools. A system of public education benefits everyone—even those families who do not have children in public

schools. It is, therefore, incumbent upon all citizens to support the public system.

This common social experience in public educational institutions should help students accept and value the rich diversity of human life. The Commission, while acknowledging the vital necessity of the public schools, nonetheless notes that such schools do not always serve all elements of the public equally well. Too often, the public schools have not sufficiently valued the vastly different backgrounds and needs of their students. They have tended to discriminate against vocational students, the children of migrant workers, blacks, females, students who can speak only Spanish or some other foreign language, and those children and young adults labeled as "slow learners." If the public schools are to command the respect and support of the entire public, they must respect the differences of the groups and individuals within that public, and they must develop new strategies for capitalizing on the strength that diversity offers.

The value of diversity is recognized in the Ten Goals of Quality Education, especially in Goal Two: acquiring the ability to enjoy and work with people of different social and racial backgrounds. But the racial and cultural tensions present in some of Pennsylvania's schools belie the achievement of this aim.

Despite progress in recent years, racism remains one of the gravest problems of our society and its schools. Seeking to avoid contact with the poor and with minority groups, many whites have fled to the suburbs, contributing to the development of separate, but unequal, school systems. Racially discriminatory attitudes also shape policies and practices within many of our schools, in matters ranging from employment opportunities—especially on the administrative level—to the use of biased testing procedures which inadequately reflect the intelligence or abilities of many minority students. In the Staffing chapter of this report, the Commission recommends that schools adopt equal opportunity hiring and promotion procedures. Recommendations in the chapters on Organization for Instruction, Supportive Services, and Management deal with other specific problems of racism.

The kinds of barriers to equal opportuinty posed by racist attitudes have their counterparts for other groups in attitudes which tend toward rigid role prescription, the inhibiting of the curiosity, creativity, and self-expression of students and the limiting of their chances for full personal growth. Sexist attitudes effectively prevent women from gaining administrative positions in education; are exhibited in many textbooks and other instructional materials; and deny equal access to some school programs, notably athletics. Also, the existence of sex-segregated

classes and activities serves to perpetuate sex stereotypes. The Commission has attempted to deal with these issues in a number of chapters, particularly Staffing, Management, Supportive Services and Curriculum.

Comparable in their damaging effects on children are the labels placed on students whose native language is not English. These pupils frequently pay a high price for cultural differences. Simply because they do not understand English well, they are often assigned to classes for "slow learners" or the mentally retarded. While many districts have responded to Commonwealth initiatives to set up bilingual programs, such special efforts are often under-staffed and under-funded.

The need for special commitments to meet special situations extends to other groups in Pennsylvania: institutionalized children and the children of migrant workers, for example. Specific strategies must be developed to meet the educational needs of children who, for whatever reasons, are unable to participate in educational programs under normal calendar and time schedules. In the Governance chapter, the Commission recommends that the Department of Education have sole responsibility for the education of these children, thereby ending the present divided authority for this function.

The problems faced by many blacks, women and non-English speaking children in our schools are largely problems of inaccurate or unfair role expectations. The sorting of children into "shop kids," "commercials," and "college preps"—categories to which the labels "slow," "average," or "bright" are too often attached—is similarly harmful and is opposed in the Curriculum and Organization for Instruction chapters.

Research has shown that teacher expectations can make a great difference in a student's growth. Thus, labeling a student "slow" may impair his or her ability and desire to learn by prejudicing the attitudes of teachers toward that student. This misguided labeling process is often supported or justified on the basis of very limited knowledge, unsophisticated testing practices or even biases of individual staff members. All barriers which interfere with the self-improvement of children must be eliminated if equal educational opportunity is to be achieved.

In the same vein, vocational-technical students have traditionally been regarded as "dull," a continuation of the age-old snobbery toward manual skills. As vocational-technical schools have opened throughout the Commonwealth, they have often attempted to change their image by being highly selective in their admissions policies. This overcompensation has contributed to the exclusion of a substantial number of deserving and interested students. Many students find themselves in the dilemma of not being "good" enough to go to college or to par-

ticipate in a vocational program, yet they are still required to attend school—captives of a system which has no place for them. In the Curriculum and Organization for Instruction chapters, the Commission urges the elimination of labeling patterns which stigmatize students and supports the exposure of all students to career development experiences.

The number of children who need our strongest efforts toward equal educational opportunity is admittedly great, but the Commission believes that every child can learn, given enough time and human and financial resources. Throughout this report, the Commission calls for the creation and operation of an educational system which treats each child as a person of unique worth and which gives each child the educational opportunities and experiences most appropriate to his or her needs and interests. Despite the fact that schools largely reflect the character of the communities they serve, and thus inherit many serious social problems, the Commission nonetheless regards the public schools as the best vehicle for promoting better interpersonal and intergroup relationships and understanding. While schools cannot be held accountable for solving serious social problems, they can make a major contribution to assure every child an ample and equal opportunity to grow into an intelligent, active and humane person.

Public-Nonpublic School Relationships

It is important that the citizens of the Commonwealth retain the right to choose a public or private school education for their children. There is substantial value, as well as constitutional legitimacy, in the existence of alternative educational philosophies and practices in a world made increasingly homogeneous by mass production technology and electronic communications systems. Educational alternatives should be encouraged within the public system as much as possible and outside that system where private financing is available.

Direct Commonwealth aid to private schools is constitutionally prohibited. The Commission believes that it is also educationally unsound. The payment of subsidies to nonpublic schools, whether directly or indirectly through reimbursement proposals such as tax credits, could divert the state from its responsibility to provide "a thorough and efficient" public school system as required by the Commonwealth's Constitution. State aid to private schools is educationally wrong because it tends to blur the distinction between public and private systems. Large scale fiscal support of nonpublic schools could lead to the extension of Commonwealth standards and policies to those schools. Such as extension could dilute the differences between public and private institutions and remove the instructional alternatives for which private schools were originally established.

Thus, while public revenue may be spent to provide essential human services such as health care and transportation for children (and adults), the Commonwealth's role in the funding and operation of these services should not arise from an effort to underwrite nonpublic education. Legislation providing essential human services should be directed toward the citizens of the Commonwealth as a whole.

Chapter IV

Curriculum

Introduction

What is worth knowing? What human attributes should our society expect its schools to encourage? The nature of society's response to these seminal questions is reflected in the curriculum of its schools and has serious implications for the continuance of society itself. Life requires purposive action; blind motion is a prelude to disaster.

The question of what is worth knowing is closely related to the question of what is worth attempting—what people *can* do and what they *should* do. Thus, developing curriculum—specifying the human attributes, attitudes and conduct to be encouraged through the instructional process—is to some extent the process of creating the future. As the title of Richard Weaver's book proclaims, *Ideas Have Consequences.*[1]

Critics have always charged that the schools of their day teach the wrong things. Two thousand years ago in Athens, Plato accused the teachers of his time with misunderstanding wisdom, declaring that their instruction amounted to a bag of tricks aimed at making their students wealthy, popular and powerful. For Plato, education was a spiritual journey; to teach only selfish, materialistic values was a corruption of the educational process.

In the early part of our century, critics made a more serious charge against modern formal instruction—that it teaches no ideals at all, only courses. It was asserted that modern schools, wrongly attempting to reflect a supposedly value-free, "scientific attitude," were replacing the attainment of wisdom—an idea of what a good life requires—with the simple acquisition of facts.[2]

These somewhat contradictory claims—that teachers teach the wrong values and ideas and that schools have retreated to the comparatively easy job of teaching facts—have been echoed recently by numerous educational critics from both ends of the political spectrum. One view holds that traditional beliefs and morals are being eroded. Supporters of this view point to student protests against duly constituted authority and express fear that sex education courses may push young people

---

[1] Richard Weaver, *Ideas Have Consequences* (Chicago, 1948).

[2] Alfred North Whitehead, *The Aims of Education* (New York, 1967), p. 29.

into premarital sexual relationships. On the other hand, many supporters of "free" schools have taken their children out of the public system, because they feel that the public schools stifle imagination and creativity and pressure students into conformity. Others point to high levels of alcoholism, drug addiction, illegitimate births, runaways and social dropouts among youth, and blame the schools for not doing more to prevent such tragedies.

Schools have been reluctant to commit themselves firmly to the teaching of values, not simply because of the previously-mentioned desire to be "objective" and "scientific," but because promoting attitudes of any sort is a controversial issue in a democracy. Almost everyone agrees that values must be taught; but the question of which values and how to teach those values brings a multitude of responses. Also, the traditional American insistence on the separation of church and state has played an important role in this situation. Many people wrongly equate the discussion of moral and value questions with religious indoctrination, and thus believe that schools should not attempt to teach values and attitudes.

Clearly, however, it *is* possible to teach values without indoctrinating students in a particular religious belief. Also, the discussion of moral issues does not necessarily require membership in a religious institution or belief in God.

Obviously, public schools in a democracy should not enforce rigid conformity of opinion; teachers should not ridicule or attack the moral, political, or religious beliefs or values of their students. However, the desire to avoid indoctrination must not prevent efforts to equip students with the tools to make the hard decisions life demands of everyone. Life requires action; individuals and groups are paralyzed or react irrationally when they lack values with which to respond to problems.

There are certain values and attitudes which all schools within the Commonwealth should try to promote. These attitudes are: personal and societal tolerance of individuals and groups who have different beliefs, habits and customs; a respect for democratic political processes which protect the rights of minorities while following the will of the majority, and which present the opportunity for discussion by relevant parties before decisions are made; the value of a diverse and pluralistic society in which each person can be proud of his or her racial, ethnic and social origins; and respect for the dignity of human life and the unique worth of each person; and personal integrity, compassion and kindness.

It is not contradictory to say that schools should not pressure students into accepting ideas and that all schools should try to develop the

previously-stated attitudes in students. Education always occurs within a definite historical and social setting and must meet the needs of a particular society in a particular period. Machine technology and the print and electronic media, for all their benefits, have tended to promote a uniformity of life style and to threaten uniqueness. Thus, schools, and other institutions, must reaffirm the value of differences, variety and personality. The encouragement of these attitudes is not incompatible with democracy; rather they are a tribute to it, for they can flourish freely only where freedom of speech and the pursuit of happiness are guaranteed to all.

The Commission recognizes the need for moral education and believes that schools have definite responsibilities in regard to the teaching of values. While the schools' capabilities and accountabilities in this area are not as great as those of parents, the active participation of professional educators in this most vital of all civilizing tasks is necessary. Schools cannot—and should not be asked to—guarantee that each student will lead a healthy, productive and satisfying life. However, schools must make an effort to confront students with the difficult, but liberating, question posed by the title of William James' essay: "What Makes a Life Significant?"[3]

Designing a curriculum is more than simply endorsing high ideals and virtues or selecting certain truths and facts over others. The development of curriculum must be guided by many factors. Curricular objectives are constrained, for example, by available instructional methods and media; by the interests and backgrounds of the students to be taught; and by the types of personal relationships permitted between adults and children in that particular society. In short, our goals and intentions are always subject to the means at our disposal.

A curriculum is not only limited by the nature of the instructional process; it must take into account the sort of life possible within the historical, geographical, environmental and biological context of the students to be instructed. A curriculum must respect the human ability of all students to learn; the Commission has taken the position that "given sufficient time and appropriate types of help, 95 per cent of students . . . can learn a subject with a high degree of mastery."[4] However, it must also pay equal attention to the powerful social and natural forces in which people are immersed. The process of developing a curriculum may thus be seen as the sifting through of the endowments

---

[3] William James, "What Makes a Life Significant?", *The Writings of William James.* J. J. McDermott, Ed. (New York, 1967).

[4] Bloom, Hastings, and Madaus, *Handbook on Formative and Summative Evaluation of Student Learning* (New York, 1971).

of past generations in an attempt to meet the demands of a future which is only partially seen. The generation which is too preoccupied with itself to anticipate the future on behalf of its children does them a great disservice.

Anticipating the future is always hazardous and difficult. There is the danger of injecting our predictions with our hopes or our fears. There is the danger of stressing one factor at the expense of others. There is also the danger that any prediction based on present realities and trends may be ultimately worthless due to unforeseeable events: accident and impersonal chance determine the outcome of human affairs more than we like to admit.

Nevertheless, no adequate curriculum can be developed nor any intelligent educational planning accomplished without a vision—however blurred—of the future. The vision behind any public school curriculum must be guided by a cautious faith. It would be as great a mistake to underestimate the importance and usefulness of recent technological developments or the growing sense of interdependence among nations, as it would be to neglect the spectre of nuclear holocaust or the catastrophic possibilities of unlimited population growth.

A good curriculum requires not only the loftiness of moral and philosophical vision, but also scientifically accurate accounts of present realities and future probabilities. A curriculum ought to reflect views of what people *should* know and do; what they realistically *can* know and do; and what schools can do to help students see these human possibilities and boundaries.

The school's curriculum is intimately tied to all other aspects of school life, in that the way things are taught and the types of relationships between the members of the school can either reinforce or undermine the school's instructional goals and objectives.

People learn informally as well as through formal instruction. Thus, the *way* people are taught is as important as—in fact, is part of—*what* they are taught. In short, there is a hidden curriculum in every school. Students learn much more than the things teachers (or parents!) intend to teach them. When the awkward girl or boy in gym class is gently coaxed into trying a move on the parallel bars, the students may be learning that it is better to use encouragement in human relationships than pressure or insults. The teacher may only have been trying to teach a particular gymnastic skill, but the students may have learned another, more important lesson in addition.

Another example of the hidden curriculum is the way in which adults treat each other in schools, *e.g.*, how they handle conflicts and tensions.

> It is a quite novel practice for most educators—teachers, parents, or administrators—to seek to use conflict openly and responsibly as a way toward learning for themselves and for those with whom they find themselves in conflict. They are more likely, in the presence of conflict, to seek to handle it by noneducative means, and then [get] back to the "business" of education, which it is assumed, takes place only in an orderly fashion, which means proceeding under the authority of rules established apart from and usually prior to the process of dialogue itself.[5]

The phrase "teaching by example" means taking seriously the fact that people constantly provide unintended lessons for those around them. The way order is established in a classroom is as much a part of the child's education as arithmetic or English. Thus, every school employe has the responsibility to examine his or her conduct in the light of the school's objectives. The hidden curriculum can be a great asset or an equally great liability in the pursuit of the educational aims reflected in the formal curriculum.

Most schools presently employ a curriculum which is based on time and subject matter. It is believed that students can and should learn a certain amount of facts and skills within a certain amount of time. When the designated amount of time is up, students are moved on to new courses, many of which require the student to have mastered the previous course material. Students are passed from Algebra I to Algebra II even if they have received a "C" or a "D" in the first course, thereby almost ensuring failure at the more advanced level.

The basic problem with the time-based/subject-oriented approach to curriculum, apart from its disregard for individual learning rates,[6] is that it makes valid measurement of student achievement difficult and, therefore, prevents effective educational accountability. These difficulties arise from the fact that the time-subject approach is not based on an adequate view of human learning. Rather, it is based on arbitrary divisions of knowledge. Students memorize the required facts for the purpose of passing an examination while their day-to-day behavior often goes unchanged. The problem with the time-subject curriculum is that it does not help the teacher determine when learning has occurred. Students often forget the large part of course content soon after the final examination is over.

The aforementioned problems have forced the Commission to consider alternatives to the present approach to curriculum. The Com-

---

[5] Kenneth Benne, "Authority in Education," *Harvard Educational Review*, LX, 3 (August, 1970), 407.

[6] This problem is more fully discussed in the Organization for Instruction chapter of this report.

mission here presents an alternative view of curriculum which challenges the current time-subject approach and recommends a particular philosophical framework for developing specific educational objectives. While endorsing the Ten Goals of Quality Education[7] as a philosophical foundation, the Commission believes that it does not have the time, resources, or right to attempt to enumerate specific curricular objectives, except for purposes of illustration. The Commisison has, however, attempted to recast the concept of curriculum and recommended procedures to develop those minimum levels of achievement which all of Pennsylvania's students should attain.[8]

The Commission proposes a definition of curriculum which focuses on the intended learning outcomes of the instructional process. The curriculum development process is, therefore, construed as the designation and structuring of specific instructional objectives with reference to broader intended learning outcomes. Table IV-A illustrates the Commission's definition.

Broad educational goals, such as helping students achieve a sense of belonging in the world or helping students develop aesthetic sensitivity, are laudable. However, trying to measure the school's success in realizing these goals is very difficult at best. The approach to curriculum recommended here is based on the belief that, "The school achieves its broad educational goals only as students acquire a multitude of specific learning outcomes."[9] The development of intended learning outcomes would permit schools to evaluate the achievement of their students both through classroom observation, formal testing procedures and follow-up studies because "the results of learning are made manifest in behavior."

> Schools customarily contrive testing situations designed to elicit behavior indicative of learning. The measure of learning is the extent to which behavior has changed. But merely because the behavior is not elicited does not mean that learning has not occurred. Furthermore, the individual's spontaneous behavior is not always altered whenever learning takes place. What does occur is a mental reorganization which makes modified behavior possible. A leading contemporary educational psychologist [Gagné] has defined learning as: ". . . a change in human disposition or capability, which can be retained, and which is not simply ascribable to growth." The immediate outcomes of learning are not behaviors but altered perceptions, conceptions and dispositions to behave.[10]

---

[7] See page 22.

[8] See recommendation 4-2.0.

[9] Mauritz Johnson, Jr., *American Secondary Schools* (New York, 1965), p. 16.

[10] *Ibid.*

TABLE IV-A

Learning Outcomes and Sample Instructional Objectives

Cognitive and Problem Solving	1. Given a set of job descriptions in nontechnical language, the student will be able to read and identify those jobs for which he or she can immediately qualify and those which require further training.
	2. After acquiring the requisite computational skills, the student will be able to prepare a budget and to balance a checking account.
	3. Given a definition of an economic issue, the student will be able to plan a procedure to resolve the issue, organize information, and present a solution compatible with his or her economic value system.
Occupational Skills and Attitudes	4. In a real or simulated hiring situation, the student will be able to complete a job application accurately and demonstrate his or her ability to respond meaningfully to questions asked in job interviews.
Empathy for Others	5. In activities like committee work, team sports, shops, home economics, laboratories or others, the student will be able to demonstrate respect for the contributions and talents of others by working with them to achieve specific group objectives or outcomes.

The fact that learning is best defined as the acquisition of the *tendency* or *disposition* to behave in a certain manner over a long period of time requires schools to develop follow-up studies of students who have advanced to higher instructional levels or who have graduated.

The Commission believes that the learning outcomes approach to curriculum, which derives specific instructional objectives from larger educational goals, is the best means of ensuring opportunities for personalized instruction and adequate measurement of student achievement.

The Ten Goals of Quality Education: The Foundation for a Learning Outcomes Curriculum

The Commission endorses the Ten Goals of Quality Education previously adopted by the State Board of Education.[11] The Goals are as follows:

I. Quality education should help every child acquire the greatest possible understanding of himself and an appreciation of his worthiness as a member of society.

II. Quality education should help every child acquire understanding and appreciation of persons belonging to social, cultural and ethnic groups different from his own.

III. Quality education should help every child acquire to the fullest extent possible for him, mastery of the basic skills in the use of words and numbers.

IV. Quality education should help every child acquire a positive attitude toward the learning process.

V. Quality education should help every child acquire the habits and attitudes associated with responsible citizenship.

VI. Quality education should help every child acquire good health habits and an understanding of the conditions necessary for the maintaining of physical and emotional well-being.

VII. Quality education should give every child opportunity and encouragement to be creative in one or more fields of endeavor.

---

[11] The Ten Goals of Quality Education were adopted by the State Board of Education in March, 1965.

VIII. Quality education should help every child understand the opportunities open to him for preparing himself for a productive life and should enable him to take full advantage of these opportunities.

IX. Quality education should help every child to understand and appreciate as much as he can of human achievement in the natural sciences, the social sciences, the humanities and the arts.

X. Quality education should help every child to prepare for a world of rapid change and unforeseeable demands in which continuing education throughout his adult life should be a normal expectation.

It is from these comprehensive educational goals that specific learning outcomes should be derived. Therefore, two important points about the Ten Goals should be noted.

The first is that the goals stress the need for cooperative relationships between teachers and students; the helping, advisory quality of teaching; and the self-initiating quality of learning.

The second point is that the Goals address both the needs of a democratic society and the needs of individual students. The Goals view socialization and self-actualization as complementary processes. As Robert M. Hutchins put it:

> The individual cannot become a human being without the democratic political community; and the democratic political community cannot be maintained without independent citizens who are qualified to govern themselves and others . . . .[12]

The Commonwealth should continue to encourage educational programs which foster unity within diversity. This is an educational necessity for democracies first noted by Aristotle: "The state . . . is a plurality, which should be united and made into a community by education."[13]

The Commonwealth's constitutional authority to create and regulate educational institutions implies that it can require the development of intended minimum learning outcomes: it must ensure that each student is given ample opportunities to equip himself with the skills and knowledge necessary to live in modern society.

---

[12] Robert M. Hutchins, "The Schools Must Stay," *The Center Magazine*, VI, 1 (January-February, 1973), 12-23.

[13] Aristotle, *The Politics*. Translated by Ernest Barker (Oxford, 1961).

The Curriculum Reform Process

Adopting the learning outcomes approach to curriculum leads to the question of who should establish educational goals and the intended learning outcomes derived from those goals. The Commission believes that both the Commonwealth (as represented by the General Assembly, the State Board of Education, and the Department of Education) and the school districts have roles to play in this process. Both of these levels of government should solicit the views of the public as well as the elements of the school itself—students, teachers, and administrators—in the process of determining specific learning outcomes.

The State Board of Education is already playing an important role in this task, having approved the previously-cited Ten Goals of Quality Education. Additionally, the Commission recommends that:

4-1.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD ADOPT THE FOLLOWING CATEGORIES OF INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES AS GUIDES FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND LOCAL DISTRICTS IN DESIGNING CURRICULAR PROGRAMS:

4-1.1 COGNITIVE, PERCEPTUAL, PHYSICAL, ARTISTIC, AESTHETIC AND HUMANISTIC OUTCOMES.

(a) Cognitive Outcomes—Schools are uniquely equipped for the introduction, development and practice of skills in reading, writing and mathematics. Extensive diagnostic work and special, individually-prescribed instructional programs may be necessary to enable some students to reach the desired level of mastery. Instruction in cognitive areas should prepare people to deal effectively with the world beyond the school and their own maturing needs.

(b) Perceptual, Physical, Aesthetic and Artistic Outcomes—All students should have, in addition to basic cognitive skills, extensive participant experience in art, drama, music, physical exercise, games and lifetime sports. Students who have an interest or ability in these areas should have opportunities to pursue their interests to the level of mastery.

(c) Social Outcomes—It is possible to teach people how to deal with the problems of crowded modern living, the complex pressures of group behavior on the individual, and interpersonal conflict. The attainment of such social skills and attitudes has always been useful and will become increasingly important in the future.

(d) Problem-solving Outcomes—Schools should teach decision-making, alternative seeking, resourcefulness and the anticipation of consequences.

4-1.2 A SENSE OF BELONGING IN THE WORLD.

Young people need a sense of the connectedness of human experience. They must understand themselves and their times as part of larger historical, geographical, physical and biological processes. They need to share in efforts to understand these forces so that they may responsibly share in efforts to shape them. Instruction in literature, the social sciences and the natural sciences should seek to develop and strengthen this awareness.

4-1.3 OCCUPATIONAL OUTCOMES.

All students should leave school with work skills and attitudes which lead them to respect and value work. The college-bound student, no less than the student who ceases formal education after high school, should have vocational skills. These skills should be developed and tested in school-directed field experience or in an actual job, evaluated jointly by the school and the employer. Work skills are a function of experience, training and attitude: all of these can be directed and influenced by schools.

There are two additional minimum outcome areas implied in the Ten Goals. These result more from the processes of instruction than from the content of curriculum.

4-1.4 SELF-DISCIPLINE, SELF-AWARENESS, AND SELF-RESPECT/EMPATHY AND WILLINGNESS TO VALUE OTHERS.

Youth who consistently receive fair treatment learn to value themselves and to give respect in return. These attributes are often learned by example, by accident or by inference. They can and should be measured if a more generous and civil citizenry is to be realized. The capacity of an individual to deal responsibly and democratically with others is essential.

4-1.5 EAGERNESS FOR LIFETIME LEARNING.

The process of schooling should maintain the student's natural enthusiasm for learning, so that the young adult who emerges from school will continue to learn throughout life. The school's curriculum should be presented in ways that meet an individual's need to know and understand, *now and later*. Teachers should help students learn to seek and find their own answers to problems in a creative and personally defensible manner.

* * *

The Commission believes that the Commonwealth's constitutionally-prescribed role in education implies that the state should specify minimum student achievement levels. The evaluation of the efforts of schools to help students reach those levels is an area in which the Commonwealth should be involved. An educational system which demands great amounts of time, energy and money from students and their parents must be accountable for providing students with at least survival skills. Therefore, to ensure that all children in the Commonwealth leave school competent to function in modern society:

4-2.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD DIRECT THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TO UNDERTAKE IMMEDIATELY A PROJECT TO DEFINE IN SPECIFIC AND MEASURABLE TERMS THE MINIMAL COMPETENCY LEVELS WHICH PENNSYLVANIA'S STUDENTS SHOULD BE EXPECTED TO ACHIEVE. THE DEPARTMENT SHOULD USE THE PREVIOUSLY-ENUMERATED CATEGORIES OF INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES AS GUIDES IN THIS PROCESS. IT SHOULD ALSO DEVELOP APPROPRIATE EVALUATION SYSTEMS.

* * *

As previously stated, the Commonwealth should attempt to involve all segments of the public in the development of a learning outcomes curriculum.

4-3.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD IMMEDIATELY BEGIN A FIVE TO TEN YEAR PLANNING PROGRAM WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING, PROFESSIONAL GROUPS, BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY, LABOR UNIONS, PARENTS, STUDENTS AND ANY OTHER RELEVANT GROUPS, TO BRING ABOUT AN ORDERLY TRANSITION FROM A TIME-BASED/SUBJECT-ORIENTED CURRICULUM TO ONE BASED ON SPECIFIC LEARNING OUTCOMES.

To facilitate this change, the present Administrator's Handbook Directive Code 61-000 Long Range Development Program[14] should be modified to require community involvement in the development and review of the Long Range Development Plan.[15] The emphasis of the plan should be changed from facility planning to curricular and/or program planning.[16]

* * *

Assuming the successful completion of the task of developing specific minimum learning outcomes which would serve as the basis of the curricular programs in the schools of the Commonwealth, the Commission recommends that:

4-4.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD GRADUALLY ELIMINATE ALL REGULATIONS WHICH MAKE REFERENCE TO OR SPECIFICALLY REQUIRE TIME AS A CRITERION FOR SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF A COURSE OR UNIT OF WORK. THE STATE BOARD SHOULD ALSO GRADUALLY ELIMINATE ALL REGULATIONS WHICH REQUIRE PARTICULAR SUBJECTS AND/OR SUBJECT TITLES, AND REPLACE THEM WITH A LIST OF REQUIRED LEARNING OUTCOMES. THIS LIST SHOULD BE ACCOMPANIED BY CRITERIA FOR SELECTING APPROPRIATE CONTENT AND EXPERIENCES TO ACHIEVE THESE OUTCOMES AND FOR MEASURING SUCH ACHIEVEMENT.

* * *

Although the Commonwealth should specify minimum learning outcomes for all of Pennsylvania's students, the Commission realizes that these outcomes would only provide a skeleton for a school's curriculum.

---

[14] *School Administrator's Handbook.* Long Range Development Program, Code 61-000 and Scope of Educational Level, Code 61-310. Pennsylvania Department of Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

[15] A Long Range Development Plan is a study to determine the school facilities that will be needed in the administrative unit for the next ten years or longer.

[16] See Management recommendation 7-20.0.

School districts, as well as the Commonwealth, have the right and responsibility to specify learning outcomes. Therefore:

4-5.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE EACH SCHOOL DISTRICT TO DEVELOP CURRICULUM PROGRAMS WHICH WILL BUILD ON COMMONWEALTH-REQUIRED INTENDED OUTCOMES AND WHICH WILL MEET THE SPECIAL NEEDS AND INTERESTS OF STUDENTS AND COMMUNITY. THESE PROGRAMS SHOULD PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS TO PURSUE PERSONAL INTERESTS IN DEPTH BEYOND COMMONWEALTH AND LOCAL STANDARDS.

The Commonwealth should clearly identify minimum intended learning outcomes, the mastery of which is essential to participation in our society. However, each district should be able to add to these minimum (mastery) outcomes. Each district should add and identify other outcomes where exposure or participation is sufficient. Mastery of the entire range of school curricula is unrealistic. For only a small number of outcomes is mastery essential for every child. Mastery outcomes should include certain basic skills in communication (reading, writing, speaking), numbers, problem solving and the development of the personal and social characteristics and attitudes essential to responsible citizenship and vocational competency. At the same time, however, every child should have the opportunity to develop a high degree of competence in some area which he or she finds highly interesting or valuable. Whether this interest is in athletics, painting, sculpture, dance, crafts, mechanics, cooking, poetry, chess, science or some other area, opportunities should be created. It is important that every student leave school having learned to do at least one thing of personal importance well.

* * *

To help school districts meet local responsibilities in curriculum planning and implementation:

4-6.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE EVERY DISTRICT TO HAVE A COMPREHENSIVE CURRICULUM PLAN WHICH WILL:

(a) Carefully identify and specify learning outcomes of local interest (a written statement of objectives to be achieved by students, together with desired levels or indices of achievement) which do not conflict with Commonwealth-required outcomes.

(b) Design a variety of instructional sequences and activities which will facilitate the optimum achievement of both Commonwealth and local outcomes.

(c) Implement a local instructional program which systematically incorporates these sequences and activities.

(d) Develop procedures for systematically evaluating:

1. The extent to which all intended learning outcomes are being achieved.

2. The efficiency of the instructional program in contributing to the achievement of all outcomes.

(e) Systematically and continually revise both objectives (outcome statements) and instructional procedures on the basis of evaluative data and changing social and student needs and interests.

Since schools have the responsibility to help educate the children of the Commonwealth, they should be able to demonstrate how effective they have been in helping students achieve the curriculum's intended outcomes.

* * *

The role of research in the curricular planning and development process should be emphasized if districts are to be immune to fads and "bandwagon" approaches to change. Change should be systematic and based on empirical evidence and solid logic. Thus:

4-7.0 EVERY SCHOOL DISTRICT SHOULD PROVIDE FUNDS TO SECURE THE RESULTS OF SIGNIFICANT RESEARCH PROJECTS AFFECTING CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION. THESE RESULTS SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE IN UNDERSTANDABLE FORM TO THE SCHOOL STAFF AND TO THE COMMUNITY. EVERY DISTRICT SHOULD SUPPORT AND CONDUCT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES APPROPRIATE FOR THE EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS AND THE IMPROVEMENT OF ITS LOCAL INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM.

In short, every district, perhaps in cooperation with other districts, the intermediate unit or a local college or university, should develop its own research capability.

Special Considerations

The Commission encourages districts to seek alternative learning environments and opportunities outside the classroom. Community resources and facilities should be used as much as possible to lend a sense of relevancy and immediacy to curricular programs. Community centers, industrial complexes, stores, business establishments, government offices, newspaper plants, television stations and private residences are potential learning centers. State parks, wildlife preserves and other outdoor areas can also be used effectively. Parents, businessmen, community leaders and homemakers with special interests and talents are educational resources and can help develop and coordinate off-campus learning programs. Teachers, however, should be intimately involved in all such programs to ensure proper curricular guidance.

4-8.0 STUDENTS SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO DEMONSTRATE ACHIEVEMENT OF SPECIFIED LEARNING OUTCOMES THROUGH PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES SPONSORED BY COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS, OR THROUGH SELF-INITIATED ACTIVITIES. SUCH ACHIEVEMENT SHOULD BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS DIRECTED TOWARD THE SAME ENDS.

* * *

Schools should strongly emphasize career education. Students should be encouraged to become aware of and to explore the many occupational opportunities that exist from the earliest years of their education. They should become informed about the multiplicity of tasks which are essential to the functioning of our complex society in order to recognize their potential contributions.

Current separations between general, college-preparatory, commercial and vocational students should be ended. *All* students should be able to explore a variety of career and vocational opportunities in addition to concentration in specific outcomes. To provide this maximum exploration, schedules and instructional programs should be as flexible as possible.

Schools should seek to provide every student with the ability to enter the job market directly with a salable skill or to pursue advanced technical or academic education. This should include an opportunity, while in school, to be trained in an occupation of choice. The concept of vocational education should be broadened to include such areas as the performing and visual arts, music, fashion design, commercial display and interior decorating. Students should be able both to explore these areas for possible career commitments and to pursue them as major areas of study.

* * *

The Commission has expressed its commitment to the development of strong career and vocational educational programs. The Commission also believes that it is important for young people to learn how to use meaningfully the large amount of leisure time provided by modern society.

Since schooling is only part of the educational process, and because learning must continue throughout a person's life, it is important for schools to encourage leisure time activities which will broaden the student's education and which will add to his own sense of worth. Extracurricular activities and clubs, intramural and lifetime sports, arts education and library and media-related activities are sources of sound recreational habits.

There are also many valuable community projects and organizations in which students should be encouraged to participate, *e.g.*, volunteer social service or environmental action programs. Volunteer social service can develop into highly satisfying lifetime avocations, with obvious benefits for the community as well as the student.

* * *

The Commission recognizes the great value of athletics and commends the many fine intramural and interscholastic programs in the

Commonwealth. Sports offer unique possibilities for the physical and moral development of young men and women. Discipline and team work are the virtues of the athlete at any age. Play is the work of youth, the activities in which they begin to form their personalities and shape their futures. Given the great psychological investment in sports made by young people, it is apparent that the relationship between coaches and players offers unique teaching and learning possibilities. Athletics is one area of school life where many students come truly eager to learn.

It is important that the development of sound intramural athletic programs have priority over spending for interscholastic teams and events in order to ensure each student adequate opportunities to experience healthy competition and to develop some degree of athletic skill. Programs devoted to providing students with instruction in lifetime sports should be encouraged both in physical education classes and in intramural programs. It is important that every student have skills in sports such as tennis, swimming, golf, bowling, cycling, archery, badminton or handball. The Commission believes that schools should offer quality programs in both intramural and interscholastic sports.

The Commission believes that it is inappropriate for any school to participate in interscholastic contests if that school is found to offer inadequate intramural programs. Interscholastic activities are often important social events which offer community members the opportunity to visit friends and to renew acquaintances. However, too much civic pride is invested in such contests, resulting in unfair pressures on board members, administrators, coaches and players. Athletics—whether interscholastic or intramural—have no place in school if they do not serve an educational purpose. Intramural activities, which serve all students, clearly must receive priority.

Making athletic programs accessible to all students also means eliminating obstacles to the development of athletic programs for women. In the past, schools have tended not to offer the same variety of athletics—either intramural or interscholastic—for girls as for boys, and not to fund girls' athletics equitably in relation to boys' athletics. A common rationale for this has been that certain interscholastic sports for boys are economically profitable for the school. Schools, however, should not be in the business of making money; in fact, they should not be permitted to charge admission to any athletic event. Schools should be concerned *only* with offering educationally sound programs, and the educational values of athletics should apply to girls and boys equally. Consequently, the Commission supports equal access to funding for both girls' and boys' sports, and for both intramural and interscholastic athletic programs.

Finally, students should be given the opportunity to achieve required physical education outcomes by such methods as contract agreement with instructors, independent study and by participation in intramural and interscholastic programs.

Summary Statement

To close, it may be helpful to summarize some of the Commission's basic beliefs and recommendations for reforming curricular practices:

1. Curricular concepts must be sufficiently open to permit continuing adjustments necessitated by changing student needs and interests and by new societal and world conditions.

2. Specific curricular objectives and processes at the school district level should be stated in a required long range curriculum plan.

3. The effectiveness of curricular planning depends to a large extent on the ability and willingness of all education levels to develop and implement appropriate evaluation and accountability measures.

4. The Commonwealth should ensure that the students in its schools are achieving at least the minimal competencies to facilitate their growth as individuals and to equip them to meet the essential demands of citizenship in a democracy.

5. School districts are expected to exceed minimum Commonwealth standards and to provide a comprehensive program tailored to local needs. Local responsibility and initiative to pursue alternative approaches to curricular implementation is encouraged.

The implementation of a meaningful curriculum depends extensively upon the manner of instruction and the quality of the professional staff. The succeeding chapters suggest ways to modify the present school system to accomplish these goals.

Chapter V

Organization for Instruction

Introduction

What is good teaching? How can we help students learn more effectively and efficiently? What classroom management practices do we want to encourage in our schools? How can we enrich the instructional program of our schools?

These are just a few of the important questions with which organization for instruction is concerned. This chapter is about those day-to-day issues with which all teachers and students are immediately and directly involved. The central concern here is: what should teachers do when teaching children and young people?

The Commission defines organization for instruction as "the interaction between a teaching agent and one or more individuals intending to learn." Instruction is to be distinguished from curriculum which the Commission is defined as "a structured series of intended learning outcomes."[1]

Attention here is focused upon relationships and processes integral to the instructional activities of schools. This attention is to be distinguished from the very important concern for the objectives of the instructional program. This chapter on Organization for Instruction is concerned with means. The Curriculum chapter of this report is concerned with ends.

Separating means from ends, while unfamiliar and artificial, nevertheless facilitates thoughtful analysis. Readers are warned, however, that the separate treatment of curriculum and instruction in this report is not intended to imply such a separation in actual school operation. Ends and means are part of a whole—the teaching-learning process must be compatible with intended learning outcomes.

Before a presentation is made of the specific suggestions for improving instruction in our schools, it is desirable to reflect upon the special significance of instruction in school operations.

---

[1] These definitions of instruction and curriculum come from Mauritz Johnson, Jr., "Definitions and Models in Curriculum Theory," *Educational Theory*, 17 (April, 1967), 121-140.

It is difficult to speak of the importance of instruction without falling into clichés. For too long, educators have given lip service to the critical nature of the learning environment in our schools without really doing much about it or being conscious of the serious harm which can be done to children and young people when they are subjected to poor instruction.

Everything about schools—buildings, books, teachers, principals, buses, microscopes and all else—have their justification for existing within the educational system because in some way, directly or indirectly, they facilitate learning.

But any attempt to get good schools without focusing directly and continuously upon the curriculum and instructional practices is surely doomed to failure.

It is not possible to have a good school without good teaching practices geared to worthy goals and objectives. Frequently, however, in our society the measure of quality in education is viewed with little reference to the nature of instruction. Schools are too often judged to be good by reference to quantitative measures, or in relation to buildings, the degrees of teachers or the amount of money spent per pupil per year.

Quantitative questions are *not* emphasized here. The need for adequate financial resources to support a quality educational program for each child is discussed in the Finance chapter of this report. This chapter *assumes* that unequal learning opportunities between schools and districts caused by a lack of money will be rectified by adopting the recommendations in the Finance chapter.

Instead, this chapter concerns itself predominantly with the human equation. What follows is an attempt to face up to the crucial questions of interpersonal relationships as they relate to the instructional process. The qualitative questions of how best to use the human and material resources in the schools are addressed here.

Improving Instruction: A Critical Need

After conducting public hearings, considering representative samples of the extensive literature available,[2] and responding to the personal experience of Commissioners, the Commission believes there are very serious problems associated with instructional practices in the schools of the Commonwealth.

Most disturbing is the gap between the words found in almost every school philosophy and what actually transpires in the classrooms in the Commonwealth.

---

[2] See Bibliography.

Schools say they believe in the importance of the individual and in the need to give each student the basic education necessary to succeed in life. But, in practice, too many schools in the Commonwealth give greater priority to serving a custodial function and providing a screening and filtering service for society than they do to facilitating learning and releasing human potential.

The Commission heard from students of all social and racial groups, and from all the major regions of the Commonwealth, reiterating their dissatisfaction towards school. These utterances give the Commission concern. What the Commission heard was as follows:[3]

"All our teachers do is talk, talk, talk. They ask all the questions. We rarely have a class discussion. All day long we sit and listen. It's so boring."

"This school doesn't recognize kids are different. The teacher teaches to the average kids in the class. The good students aren't challenged and the slower students can't keep up. If you miss more than a couple of days you've had it. A whole term can go down the drain."

"It's the same old program year after year. There is no difference between what I'm getting now and what my brother had in this grade. It's like that business of the IBM card 'Please don't fold, spindle or mutilate.' They treat us as if we were all just alike."

"This year I'm in serious trouble in Algebra II. They went so fast last year in Algebra I. I never really understood it. I got C's then. Now I'm getting D's. My chances of going to college are not going to be very good if I fail math. I'm very worried."

"They tell us here in school we are to be good students and work hard. But they never really give us much choice in what we study. It's rough trying to succeed at something you hate doing. We need a lot more electives around here. When I study things I like, it makes me feel good inside. It makes the homework less painful when you know you asked to be in a particular course or subject."

"I'm tired of being a second class citizen in this school. The college prep kids get the best teachers and first choice on course selection. They generally treat us as dummies around here. I don't know how I got in this losing track but my guidance counselor tells me those tests I took last year mean I can't make it. This place makes me so mad I hate it. I hate it."

"This school is too big and it's run like a factory. On the days when the principal or teachers are angry, it's run like a prison. You would not believe the rules they have in this place. A 'hall pass' is required

[3] These are not quotations. They represent the spirit of many comments frequently repeated at Commission public hearings, either by students or their parents.

to go to the library even when the teacher sends you there to do an assignment. It's really weird. It gets on your nerves. Bells, bulletins, no students allowed signs, closed lunches, smelly locker rooms. Bad, man, it's really bad. The other day I got five days detention for cutting gym. And then I find out from my buddies our gym teacher left the class early to go to football practice. The double standards in this place really bug me."

"The Student Council in this school is a joke. It's a rubber stamp for the Administration."

"I heard the other day that my buddy in the next school district works with a computer. She actually helps program it. Why can't we have some of that kind of stuff, too?"

"They should open schools for use in evenings, weekends and in the summer. Around here, school is the only place to play basketball and swim in the winter. Our parents pay for these facilities. Why can't we use them?"

These voices are protesting the following:

—the passivity of student life
—the rigidity of the typical graded school
—the ignoring of individual differences
—the failure to help students master skills needed for advanced work
—the lack of decision-making authority
—the lock-step nature of the "system"
—the negative identity associated with traditional tracking systems
—the school bureaucracy which seemingly serves student interest last in priority
—the powerlessness of being a student
—the absence of the use of modern technology to facilitate learning
—the traditionalism which retards the development of such ideas as the year-round school.

The Commission believes these criticisms deserve its consideration. These weaknesses in our instructional processes are serious and widespread.

The Commission Advocates Flexible and Personalized Education

Major changes in instruction are essential. The changes needed are so substantive and so profound as to require a whole new perception of the educational process.

The system must change from one which focuses primarily upon

teaching to a system which focuses primarily upon learning. To achieve this substantive change, the Commission proposes the following recommendation and its related parts:

5-1.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD ENDORSE BUT NOT MANDATE THE CONCEPT OF FLEXIBLE AND PERSONALIZED EDUCATION AS A SET OF IDEAL EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES FOR THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS.[4] WE DEFINE THESE CONCEPTS AS INCLUDING AT LEAST THE FOLLOWING:

5-1.1 INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS SHOULD EMPHASIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

When changing the teaching process from merely imparting facts to facilitating learning, it is essential to encourage curiosity. This is especially true if the goal is to promote a citizenry wth a life-long interest in learning.

With such an intent, it is essential to provide students with learning experiences in an environment[5] which gives ample opportunity for discovery and exploration. Emphasizing this approach to learning requires schools well supplied with a wide variety of learning materials.[6]

Students should be made aware of local news, customs, practices and problems common to their experience to help them connect instruction with their personal world. The environment beyond the school should be used whenever feasible.

Building upon this principle, the Commission recommends the following:

5-1.2 FULL USE SHOULD BE MADE OF THE HUMAN AND PHYSICAL RESOURCES OF THE COMMUNITY WHEN THEY ARE MOST APPROPRIATE TO ACHIEVING LEARNING OUTCOMES. THE USE OF SUCH COMMUNITY RESOURCES SHOULD BE AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM OF EACH SCHOOL.

Utilization of the community creates an almost unlimited number of possibilities for encouraging discovery and exploration experiences for students. This enrichment process is a two way process bringing community resources into the school and taking students out into the community.

The personalization of the educational process requires tailoring school scheduling practices to the divergent needs of students and to the different groups in the community. School scheduling practices

[4] Flexible and personalized education is a phrase used by this Commission to facilitate communication and in order to avoid the confusion or presuppositions which might be attached to such phrases as "continuous progress" or "individualized instruction."

[5] The word "environment" here is used in the sense of "milieu" not in its biological sense.

[6] Using teacher-made materials would reduce the need to increase greatly the budget for the purchase of commercial materials.

should facilitate and not hamper the use of community resources. If some parents desire to ensure their children's maximum opportunity for moral and spiritual development in conjunction with their religious leaders and organizations, they should not be hindered by rigid school scheduling practices. The use of community resources such as religious groups can become a reality only if schools are willing to be flexible in their administrative practices. As districts develop local learning outcomes as suggested in the Curriculum chapter of this report, it becomes all the more important to use all available community resources as widely and as effectively as possible.

In addition, the personalization of the educational process requires tailoring to the divergent needs of the different types of communities which exist in the Commonwealth. As districts develop local learning outcomes (as suggested in the Curriculum chapter of this report), it becomes all the more important to use community resources widely and effectively.[7]

5-1.3 INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS SHOULD OFFER A BROAD EXPERIENTIAL BASE.

If students are active, the passivity syndrome will be overcome. Also, students need to be provided a wide variety of experiences in order to maximize opportunities for their self-development.

Students should be involved in more diverse activities in schools than they customarily have been. The manual arts, fine arts, dance, physical exercise, drama and journalism are some experiences to which all students should be exposed. Such activities would help improve the development of skills in reading and mathematics which often are taught solely by rote or drill methods. A diversity of experiences, with emphasis on student initiative in their direction, will greatly facilitate students' social, emotional and intellectual development.

A school program should offer a range of tasks from the very abstract to the very concrete in order to increase the likelihood that every student will have at least one significant success experience in school. Nothing is more critical to personalizing educational programs than helping children and young people generate a genuine feeling of accomplishment. If the sense of personal worth is ever to be taken seriously in our schools, every possible effort must be made to unleash and to develop the potential for creativity which exists in every individual, regardless of his racial or social origin.

A broad experiential program is important for another reason. Students should be given a considerable degree of choice in selecting their

---

[7] See Supportive Services chapter.

studies. Helping people learn how to make wise choices or informed decisions is one of the most important aspects of a personalized and flexible educational program.

During public hearings held by this Commission, some educators who testified seriously questioned the desirability of giving a considerable degree of choice to students in selecting their studies.

This concern by educators is understandable. But, what must be avoided at all costs is a patronizing view which insists on saying always "We know better" and produces the dehumanizing characteristics of institutions which are pre-eminently custodial in nature. The emphasis must be upon helping people to cope by themselves. Students must not be viewed as being passive "consumers" of education. The primary burden of persuasion must rest upon those who would restrict the freedom of individuals over the direction of their lives rather than upon those asserting the right for self-direction.

If a student uses freedom to make choices unwisely, he or she should be given the chance to take corrective action. While inconvenience, discomfort or loss of progress which results from a poor choice could be a valuable learning experience, educators do need to provide wise guidance and real help to young people. The greatest concern of educators should be counseling, advising, suggesting or helping students in making all kinds of choices.[8]

Another reason for offering a broad experiential program is to provide for the unique learning styles represented in any group of students. The relevance of students' studies will likely be increased by expanding the methods of instruction. Special effort should be made to provide both inductive and deductive approaches to learning.

5-I.4 STUDENTS SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO LEARN FROM EACH OTHER.

Students need to be in association with each other. Tutorial relationships should be encouraged. Frequent opportunities should be provided for students to work together on projects of mutual interest. Instructional strategies which cause students to be isolated from each other for long periods should be avoided. "Education is a profoundly social process."[9]

Frequently, students can reach other students with instructional strategies which adults might never think of. We need to enlist the

---

[8] The reader is directed to the Supportive Services chapter of this report which discusses the crucial role of counseling.

[9] Douglas Heath, Professor of Psychology, Haverford College, in address at Founder's Hall, Hershey, Pennsylvania, November 17, 1972. Entitled "Educational Wonderland: Myth or Reality," this speech is to be printed in the Summer 1973 issue of the *Chicago Review*.

creativity and idealism of our young people in improving the instructional process.

5-1.5 TEACHERS SHOULD ACT AS GUIDES, PARTNERS AND FACILITATORS OF THE LEARNING PROCESS RATHER THAN SOLELY AS DISPENSERS OF KNOWLEDGE.

Such a role change is imperative if the realization of the Commission's desire to personalize education is to occur. Earlier it was stressed that students should be active participants in the learning process, should be able to make significant choices in their studies, and should be engaged in instruction which makes discovery and exploration a significant part of the learning experience.

Teachers must be active as facilitators of learning. They must not be remote or aloof; to permit students to wander aimlessly without guidance or supervision is the opposite of good teaching. Teachers need to become more closely aware of the welfare and needs of their students and less preoccupied with dispensing information. When a teacher is available to give personal help to a student, he or she is truly personalizing the educational process. Supportive help in this fashion can transform a detached passive student into a really active learner. The establishment of a sense of empathy between the teacher and student is central to the development of a personalized and flexible education program.[10]

Changing the emphasis in teaching from dispensing knowledge to facilitating learning increases "the humanness" of the system. This benefit alone merits making the changes. However, there is another reason for shifting the emphasis. The expansion of knowledge is occurring at such a rapid rate that the teacher's knowledge can easily become outdated. It is impossible to occupy an authentic "know it all" stance. The most appropriate model for the teacher in this circumstance is not the authority figure but one who continues to learn in association with his or her students. The stress should be on teaching the skills of learning. Such an approach to teaching will aid greatly in improving communication in the classroom.

Teachers are going to have to retrain themselves as they change their functions, giving primary emphasis to facilitating learning. They should develop skills in diagnostic practices which enable them to make appropriate and accurate decisions when prescribing learning experiences for children and young people.[11] The skill that teachers need to perfect is the ability to promote continuous progress in learn-

[10] Consult the works of Carl Rogers and Arthur Combs in the Bibliography.

[11] See the Supportive Service and Staffing chapters of this report for discussion of in-service education.

ing so that serious gaps, deficiencies, interruptions or obstacles to continued success are minimized as much as possible.

The role of the teacher as diagnostician is central to the last major characteristic of personalized and flexible educational programs.

Students should be encouraged to view learning as a continuous process and not as something that comes in annual graded 180-day segments, loosely correlated to each other.

Establishing individual rates of progress for each student should be a high priority in organizing instructional programs. The present typical graded approach to instruction rigidifies the curriculum and forces students into pigeonholes related primarily to age rather than the state of development of each child when instruction begins. The graded program, likened to the factory with its assembly line, perpetuates a standardized group norm approach to instruction which is inimical to humanizing the learning process.

In a nongraded approach, the practice of having individual expectancy levels for students lifts the crushing burden from the "slow learners." While competition is a fact of life in our society, it can have negative and unwholesome effects if it pits the least able in the learning process against those most able to learn. The Commission believes competition should stimulate initiative, not destroy it. A carefully thought out nongraded system makes academic competition more of a contest between equals than is presently the case. Therefore:

5-1.6 SOME FORM OF NONGRADED INSTRUCTION SHOULD BE USED.

Organizing instruction with some form of nongradedness shifts the basis for offering programs from spending time in class (the Carnegie Unit) to acquiring skills and knowledge as outlined in the Curriculum chapter of this report. In a nongraded program a curriculum is achievement (competency) based. What a student has learned, rather than how long he or she has been in a classroom, becomes the key question. This situation makes it essential that nongradedness be a basic component of any competency-based approach to curriculum.

With this approach to instruction, students are able to progress at their own rate of learning. Such a system has the advantage of facilitating a natural transition from one level of study to the next.

If a student needs a certain skill for further development in a subject, the student should have sufficient time to master that skill before advancing to the next level of study. This is more likely to occur in a nongraded approach. This eliminates failures caused primarily by premature advancement to the next level of study.

* * *

A major advantage of a nongraded approach to instruction is the improvement of grouping practices in such programs. Grouping students today in many schools is more associated with custodial or sociological reasons than with educational reasons. Social stigmas often emerge out of an undue emphasis on long-term tracking and grouping practices, the origin of which is the impersonal nature of the graded system.

This Commission believes grouping is inevitable and necessary in any large educational enterprise. It does not oppose the concept of grouping, only the way the concept is most often implemented.

Sophisticated diagnostic techniques should be used in forming groups. There should be differentiated teaching in different types of groups. The group's reason for being should be correlated solely with instructional intent. Thus, groups should be formed for short-term specific purposes and should not be permitted to harden into tracks or segregated programs of study such as "Commercial" or "College Preparatory." Accordingly, the Commission recommends:

5-2.6 SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHOULD DISCONTINUE THE ROUTINE USE OF GROUP I.Q. AND NATIONALLY STANDARDIZED ACHIEVEMENT TESTING PROGRAMS FOR THE PURPOSE OF PLACING STUDENTS IN PARTICULAR INSTRUCTIONAL GROUPS OR CURRICULAR TRACKS. INSTEAD, INDIVIDUALIZED DIAGNOSTIC TESTS, SYSTEMATIC TEACHER OBSERVATIONS AND OTHER PROCEDURES FOR PLANNING INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS BASED ON INDIVIDUAL NEEDS SHOULD BE USED. THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD SERVE IN AN ADVOCACY ROLE WHERE SCHOOL DISTRICTS PERSIST IN USING STANDARDIZED TESTS IMPROPERLY.

The Commission is not recommending that a child visit a clinical psychologist every time a decision is made about his or her program of studies. Grouping practices should be personalized, however, using instruments created by the district wherever possible. These instruments should reflect what the district actually intends to stress in its instruction. A diagnostic test[12] is a special kind of test different in substance and more specialized in intent than the commonly used commercially prepared national achievements tests or I.Q. tests.

* * *

A quality much needed in our schools is more flexible use of our professional and supportive staff. A nongraded approach facilitates

[12] An example of a diagnostic test is one designed to learn if a child can distinguish between long and short vowel sounds in reading. This kind of test measures just this ability.

such use as much as a graded program tends to be inflexible in the use of personnel. Therefore:

5-3.0 EVERY SCHOOL DISTRICT SHOULD DEVELOP MORE FUNCTIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL, ADMINISTRATIVE AND STAFFING PATTERNS TO FACILITATE THE ACHIEVEMENT OF PRESCRIBED LEARNING OUTCOMES AND NONGRADED PROGRAMS.[13]

The use of human and material resources in a more rational manner is necessary in establishing nongraded programs and in personalizing instruction. Computers and teaching machines can be used, for instance, to free teachers from drill work and other tasks for which direct contact with a teacher is not necessary. This will enable the teacher to do those essential guidance tasks which no machine can ever accomplish. The use of specialized resource teachers can assist the regular teachers in doing sophisticated diagnostic or remedial work. The use of aides and community volunteers is also facilitated when nongrading is used.

* * *

A critical aspect of the use of some form of nongradedness is provision for flexible entry into and exit from such an educational program. It is the view of the Commission that students should be given greater choice in determining when they attend school. Students should be permitted to start earlier and leave earlier than at the present time. Alternative schedules for attendance could be provided by year-round attendance for those who desire it. Therefore:

5-4.0 SCHOOLS SHOULD BE AVAILABLE AND USED FOR INSTRUCTIONAL PURPOSES ON A YEAR-ROUND BASIS.

If this is to occur, schools should be air-conditioned.[14]

The ultimate form of personalized education is one which permits students to take their instruction at times and places where their needs and interests can be served, permitting them to work or engage in other "interruptions" of their studies without penalty. Schools would then operate more like libraries than like factories.

* * *

[13] Recommendation 5-5.0 of this chapter and recommendation 8-3.0 of the Governance chapter stress the need to recodify the School Code. An important consideration in this recodification should be to make the certification of teachers more flexible in order to make teacher assignments based on learner needs. Such a liberalization should eliminate the sharp delineation between "elementary" and "secondary" certification. The possibility of using a single certificate should be explored.

[14] See recommendations 7-14.0 and 7-15.0 of the Management chapter of this report.

The kind of flexible and personalized education advocated in this Commission report will require a highly developed use of educational technology.[15]

The concept of nongraded instruction and the wide variety of specific forms of this concept are illustrations of how educational technology in the broader sense has produced ways to improve education.

In nongraded programs, there is frequent use of electronic devices such as computers and television. However, these devices are the tools technologists use to carry out the plan for the reorganized allocation of the human and material resources in instruction. The tools are not ends in themselves.

The Commission believes strongly in the value and importance of educational technology, but it is aware that there is a danger inherent in the use of such technology.

The dilemma is this. We need a highly developed educational technology to obtain the kind of flexible and personalized education herein advocated. But teachers often lack the knowledge to use technology wisely. When such a lack of knowledge occurs, teachers use technology ineffectively or they are intimidated by it and avoid using it. They act then as if it did not exist.

The ineffective or inappropriate use of technology can be very dehumanizing. Machines and their allied instructional "softwares" can treat children as mindless robots.

The Commission deplores the faddist use of gadgets or instructional strategies which regiments children while intending to liberate them. But it hopes such bungling will not kill interest in the need to perfect educational technology and to use it in ways compatible with the ideals of this Commission.

Our children live in a world with sophisticated technology playing a part in every aspect of their lives. Television is just one dimension of this electronic age in which they live. It is not surprising then that they can suffer "cultural shock" if forced to attend classes which do not make effective use of any modern media forms. For better or for worse, television, film and record player are part of their learning style before they ever get to school. Educators forget this at their peril.

---

[15] The Commission wishes to distinguish between the common use of the word "technology," as referring almost exclusively to machines, and a broader definition which draws upon the scientific method with reference to the allocation and organization of human and nonhuman resources. This latter definition has been defined by Harvard Professor of Economics, John K. Galbraith, in *The New Industrial State* Second Edition (Boston, 1971), p. 12, as "the systematic application of scientific or other organized knowledge to practical tasks." The failure to make this clear distinction is a source of confusion in the discussion of efforts to improve education.

The challenge facing education, then, is the challenge facing our world: we must use technology and we must use it to its fullest to broaden our exposure, to increase our range of ideas, to provide us with new forms of communication and new perspectives on the nature of experience. We must be prepared to support examples of technology in education—like public broadcasting—which show themselves capable of doing this. But we must not be seduced into believing that the machine really is all. As John Kenneth Galbraith cautions about the growth of technology in *The New Industrial State:*

> Nor is the good fortune unqualified. The subordination of belief to industrial necessity and convenience is not in accordance with the greatest vision of man.[16]

Making It Happen: Some Suggestions

It is easy to advocate any agenda for improving instruction, but it is another matter to see improved instruction actually occur in the classrooms across the Commonwealth. The ideals of the Commission will remain just that if there is a neglect of implementation strategies.

It should be stated again that the Commission is not recommending mandating its version of flexible and personalized education. It is the position of this Commission that instructional practices—the means used to obtain the goals of instruction—should never be dictated by the Commonwealth. That has not been proposed here. The Commission has suggested a set of ideal practices which the State Board of Education should *endorse*, just as it has already adopted a set of ideal educational goals.

By formally advocating flexible and personalized educational programs as defined by this Commission, the State Board of Education and the Department of Education will be exercising a form of leadership which is designed to emphasize and promote the importance of the concepts without mandating them. Such leadership will end the current official silence of the State Board of Education on matters relating to instruction without usurping local prerogatives and local initiatives.

Having the State Board of Education and Department of Education go on record will help promote the set of ideal practices herein suggested. But this is not enough. To take a stand merely on what it believes is right provides insufficient leverage to the State Board of Education in effecting change. Additional initiatives are required if anything is to happen.

---

[16] *Ibid.*

The State Board of Education should require school districts to assess their instructional practices on a regular basis.[17] This is essential if instructional practices are to reflect the deliberateness and care called for by personalization and flexibility. A regular process evaluation sponsored by the Department of Education as directed by the State Board will have this effect.

Instructional programs in school districts should be compared with the ideal practices suggested by this Commission to help local educators and citizens decide whether their current approaches to instruction are compatible with the stated local philosophy and whether the local philosophy needs reworking in light of the Commonwealth's position.

The Commission believes school districts should have the freedom not to adopt the direction advocated in this section. They should not, however, be permitted to go for long periods of time without careful consideration of the methods of instruction used in their schools. Ideally, self-monitoring should be adequate, but this Commission believes that regular "prodding" by the Department of Education is necessary.

Another very real problem which retards improvement of instruction is the fact that making changes in instructional practices costs money for such things as in-service education, new materials and evaluation. It is not easy to ask for higher taxes to try some new program which may or may not work.

Therefore, the Commission advocates that financial incentives be provided for school districts seeking to improve their instructional programs.[18] The small noncompetitive grants recommended in the Finance chapter should be made available to school districts to encourage curriculum development and instructional improvement activities that are locally designed and operated. Districts should not have to move in the same direction as suggested in this report to receive the proposed incentive funds. To try to enforce some uniform pattern of instruction in the Commonwealth is undesirable and is incompatible with the idea of flexibility.

The Commission, in urging an incentive grant program, seeks to instill into the "change process" a grass roots commitment to change. Educators in each school must develop the feeling that innovations are their own—something they want to have succeed and not something someone in Harrisburg is trying to force upon them.

---

[17] See recommendation 8-10.0 of the Governance chapter of this report.

[18] See recommendation 10-12.0 in the Finance chapter.

Changing Laws, Regulations and Guidelines to Promote Personalized and Flexible Educational Programs

The Commission believes a four step process is required to make personalized and flexible educational programs a reality. Three of these steps have already been described.[19] A fourth step is needed.

As stated earlier, the standard method for organizing schools has been the graded system, *e.g.*, grouping children by age into elementary and secondary schools. This system, which had its origin in the 1840's, has existed so long and is so entrenched that it is considered the "normal" way to operate schools. For many years this graded system has been perceived not only as the best way, but the only way. Consequently, the School Code and State Board Regulations are framed in the belief that the graded system is superior to other forms. Current laws and regulations require those who want to depart from the traditional system to obtain prior approval justifying such changes as experimental efforts. Everything, from certifying teachers, approving curriculum and awarding subsidy payments, is correlated to the traditional graded system. Such a circumstance hardly encourages the operation of a personalized and flexible educational system. Legally speaking, as things now stand, there is a great amount of impersonality and inflexibility built into the School Code and allied regulations.

Therefore, the Commission recommends:

5-5.0 ALL EXISTING SCHOOL CODE PROVISIONS, STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION REGULATIONS AND DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION GUIDELINES WHICH MANDATE GRADEDNESS OR CREATE CONSTRAINTS WHICH MAY HINDER THE OPERATIONS OF FLEXIBLE AND PERSONALIZED EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS SHOULD BE ELIMINATED.

This fourth step is a process of "cleaning house." Laws, regulations or guidelines which mandate gradedness or make flexibility difficult must be changed. The Commission is not recommending mandating nongradedness. It is doing the opposite. It is suggesting that the legal props sustaining gradedness be removed so that any district may institute whatever degree of gradedness or nongradedness it wishes. Any school district may retain its existing instructional practices. However, the state would no longer require preapproval to change a graded structure as the Code now stipulates.

The Commission does not want the significance of this recommendation to be overlooked because it does not impose a new model for

[19] Step one: Defining the concept; step two: Requiring process evaluations; step three: Providing districts with incentive grants.

organizing instruction. Many customary assumptions are challenged by the above recommendation. For example, the Commission believes that:

a. No one model of instruction or organization for instruction is appropriate for all students. A variety of approaches is needed.

b. The entities called "the elementary curriculum" and "the secondary curriculum" are highly arbitrary and relative divisions of the school's curriculum.[20]

c. There is no substance to such hotly debated questions as whether high schools should have 6, 4 or 3-year organizational patterns, or whether the middle school is inherently superior to the junior high school.

d. While it seems obvious that a child's early learning experiences can affect his later educational performance, it seems of little value to argue that the earlier or later years of a student's education are more important in themselves.

e. It is questionable to assume that some central state agency is best equipped to determine the validity of methods of organizing for instruction in a specific school.

* * *

The Commission has a number of recommendations to make regarding current provisions of the Pennsylvania School Code.

A very controversial question which the Commission debated was "What is the best age to require children to start school?" After considerable discussion, the Commission came to the conclusion that the best approach to this question is to reaffirm an existing provision of the Code which encourages a flexible policy in this area. Therefore:

5-5.1 SCHOOL ATTENDANCE SHOULD BE OPTIONAL FOR ALL CHILDREN BETWEEN AGES 4 AND 8.[21]

The Commission does not favor mandating the school attendance of all four or five year old children. Parents should continue to have the option of enrolling their children in school up to age eight.

* * *

A related problem pertaining to school attendance is the present provision in the Code which requires that a child, once intially enrolled in school, must remain in school no matter how premature the decision might have been to enroll the child. Therefore:

[20] See footnote 13 in this chapter.

[21] See recommendation 8-14.0 in the Governance chapter of this report which discusses the need for a State Master Plan for Early Childhood Education.

5-5.2 ANY PARENT WITH PRIOR NOTICE TO THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION SHOULD BE ABLE TO REMOVE FROM SCHOOL ANY CHILD FROM AGES 4 TO 8.

If a child were enrolled in good faith by his parents and it proved to be a premature entry, the child could be removed before serious damage to the child's sense of worth as a person could occur. It simply is not possible to make foolproof decisions on what is the best age to begin children in school. The regulations should allow for flexibility in this instance.

* * *

Under current state funding procedures, when districts initiate new programs such as kindergarten, they must incur the first year cost themselves, waiting for payment one year later. This delay discourages "start-ups" of new programs.

Also, current state funding practices tend to be related only to mandated services and programs. Reimbursements should apply equally for optional programs as for mandated ones. Therefore:

5-5.3 ALL OPTIONAL PROGRAMS SHOULD RECEIVE APPROPRIATE STATE PAYMENTS AT THE TIME OF "START-UP" AND NOT ONE YEAR LATER AS CURRENT PROCEDURES PROVIDE.

This change would remove a major financial burden now associated with starting new programs and will be complementary to the views of the Commission expressed in the Finance chapter of this report.[22]

* * *

It is common knowledge that the traditional high school diploma has lost whatever significance it once had. Since it has as its reference point years of attendance in school in a graded system, the diploma is deficient as a symbol of a certain level of educational development. It is also incompatible with the views on curriculum and instruction in this report. The Commission believes that the best way to correct this situation is to issue students exit certificates connected to specific competencies required for graduation. Therefore:

5-5.4 ONLY ONE EXIT CERTIFICATE FOR STUDENTS FROM SCHOOL SHOULD BE PERMITTED. THIS SHOULD BE A CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCIES OBTAINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CURRICULUM CHAPTER. NO REFERENCE TO GRADES OR YEARS ATTENDED SHOULD BE MADE ON THIS SINGLE EXIT CERTIFICATE.

This change will help shift the public's attention from how long a student attended school to what it is the student can do. This will help combat some of the undesirable aspects of "credentialism" which de-

[22] See recommendation 10-3.0 of the Finance chapter.

velop when diplomas lose their significance. This recommendation is an attempt to assist future employers and others in assessing graduates of the Commonwealth's school system. The use of this certificate would permit some students to end their basic education earlier than at present. Therefore, provisions for facilitating the transition to the world of work or further study, whether it is in the local school or elsewhere, should be made if the system is not to be charged with "dumping kids onto the street." This would destroy the current arbitrary definition of basic education as a twelve-year process.

* * *

There is a serious constraint on operating personalized and flexible instructional systems created by the way the state subsidy system functions. The present school subsidy factors give a weighted factor of 1.36 to 1.0 for secondary students as compared to elementary students. This figure of 1.36 is based on past differential cost data in educating secondary students as compared to elementary students.[23]

It is impossible with this present system to connect subsidy payment with the actual costs of educating a child regardless of his age. It is conceivable to this Commission that many children in what now constitutes the elementary school could benefit from the opportunities available to secondary students and should, therefore, be similarly weighted in calculating the formula. The kind of instructional programs children receive, not the grade level they attend, should be the basis for making subsidy payments. Therefore:

5-5.5 GRADEDNESS SHOULD NO LONGER BE A COMPUTED FACTOR IN THE STATE SUBSIDY FORMULA. THE WEIGHTED AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP FACTOR SHOULD RELATE TO THE COST OF PROGRAM OFFERINGS RATHER THAN TO GRADE LEVELS. PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN SHOULD NOT BE SHARPLY DELINEATED AS EITHER "ELEMENTARY" OR "SECONDARY." DISTRICTS SHOULD NOT RECEIVE LESS STATE MONEY UNDER THIS ARRANGEMENT.

Ultimately, the words "elementary" and "secondary" should be laid to rest as terms appropriate only to rigidly graded systems. In the future, schools should be much more flexible about who teaches and what is taught to younger and older children. This will make it difficult to pigeonhole children on an age basis.

* * *

There is hardly any element of the School Code more inflexible than the compulsory school attendance requirement. The current law which requires 180 days fixed at a specified number of hours per day has outlived its usefulness.

[23] See the Finance chapter for a description of the state subsidy system.

While the Commission believes it is desirable to continue to require children to attend school, it is not necessary to adhere to the current standardized school year. The law which presently permits exceptions to the 180 day requirement only with prior approval restricts innovations in scheduling the attendance of children at school.

To encourage flexibility, the state should require a minimum school year in terms of hours not days. This would permit districts to experiment with a variety of school attendance arrangements suited to local community needs. Therefore:

5-5.6 STATE REQUIREMENTS REGARDING THE LENGTH OF THE SCHOOL YEAR FOR STUDENTS SHOULD RANGE FROM 900 HOURS MINIMUM TO 1200 HOURS MAXIMUM FOR STUDENTS 8 YEARS OR OLDER. THE STATE SHOULD NOT PRESCRIBE THE LENGTH OF THE SCHOOL DAY FOR STUDENTS IN TERMS OF HOURS OR THE SCHOOL YEAR FOR STUDENTS IN TERMS OF DAYS. THESE MATTERS SHOULD BE LEFT TO THE DISCRETION OF EACH DISTRICT, PROVIDED STUDENTS MEET ANNUAL MINIMUM HOURLY REQUIREMENTS.

The Commission hopes some imaginative models of arranging the school year will emerge with the liberalization. In some communities in other states, experiments are being made with the four day week. There are an infinite number of possible arrangements. Hopefully, it will be sooner rather than later that such trial programs are launched in Pennsylvania.

* * *

Another element of the inflexibility of school attendance regulations is the very limited provision for excused absence from school. In practice, sickness is the only basis for being legally absent from school.

If a family is to take a trip to Europe for two weeks, for example, their children must be given an "unexcused" absence despite the obvious educational benefits of such a trip.

The present laws may encourage misrepresentation or careless administration because of their rigidity in matters of school attendance.

The Commission believes students should be excused from attending school for "just cause." This excusal should be permitted for as long as an entire school year if deemed justifiable as a result of a joint agreement between district officials and parents.

For example, a school pupil may be considering quitting school because he is alienated toward school at the moment. He could be given a term's absence to think it over and perhaps start working. He would be on leave and not considered a dropout. At the end of the term, he could be reinstated easily and simply as one returning from leave, thereby avoiding the sigma of dropout. Therefore:

5-5.7 SHORT-TERM AND LONG-TERM (UP TO A YEAR'S DURATION) LEAVE PROGRAMS FOR STUDENTS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED, GIVING STUDENTS EXEMPTIONS FROM COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE FOR "JUST CAUSE" AND WITH PROPER GUIDELINES TO PREVENT ABUSE.

The purpose of liberalizing this provision of the School Code is to deal with "hardship" cases which require individual treatment not now permitted. Such a program needs safeguards to prevent excesses. Long-term leaves should require the action of school boards. Short-term leaves should be authorized without the need to have school board approval.

* * *

The one remaining topic to which this Commission addresses itself in this chapter of the report is the controversial question of school size.

This Commission is faced with the opposite situation which faced the Lawrence commission.[24] In the 1960's, many schools, especially secondary schools, were so small as to be unable to offer an adequate educational program. The General Assembly responded to this concern, and school districts were reorganized as a result of Acts 299 and 150.

The Commonwealth now faces the problem of schools becoming too large. This Commission believes that beyond a certain point, the larger the educational unit the more deleterious the effects on the psychological, social and academic well-being of the student tend to be, especially for elementary children. Numerous educational critics[25] have noted the impersonality and factory-like quality of big schools. Students, teachers, employes, even administrative staff, tend to show little identification with or loyalty to big schools. The bureaucratic atmosphere which pervades many large schools is not a healthy learning environment. Another characteristic of large schools (and school districts) is that they resist change. Professor James G. Anderson of Johns Hopkins University argues that, "As size increases, so does the impersonal treatment of students and, in general, the resistance to innovation."[26]

Personalized instruction is a subtle process. If the proper environment is to be encouraged, it is necessary to organize schools with this fact in mind. Therefore:

5-6.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD ADOPT THE FOLLOWING FIGURES AS GUIDES FOR SCHOOL SIZE FOR DISTRICTS: ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS SHOULD HAVE NO MORE THAN 500 PUPILS.

---

[24] The Committee on Education, appointed by David L. Lawrence, Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (1960-1961).

[25] See works of Douglas Heath and John Holt in the Bibliography.

[26] James G. Anderson, *Bureaucracy in Education* (Baltimore, 1968), p. 146.

MIDDLE SCHOOLS SHOULD HAVE NO MORE THAN 1,000 PUPILS. SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS SHOULD HAVE NO MORE THAN 1,500 PUPILS.

The Commission recognizes that there is little research evidence for fixing such specific numbers for the upper size limits for schools. Therefore, it should be clear to all that the Commission is talking about *guides*, not regulations.

* * *

Furthermore, the Commission wants to insist on the distinction between the word "school" as a series of human relationships and the word "school" meaning a building. This is an important distinction and to make this point emphatic, the Commission recommends:

5-7.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD ENDORSE THE SCHOOLS-WITHIN-SCHOOLS CONCEPT, IN WHICH LARGE STUDENT POPULATIONS WITHIN A SINGLE BUILDING ARE DIVIDED INTO SEVERAL SMALLER UNITS (SCHOOLS) AS A MEANS OF OVERCOMING THE POOR LEARNING ATMOSPHERES CHARACTERISTIC OF MANY BIG SCHOOLS.

In a school-within-a-school concept, each unit can maintain its own identity by offering different curricular programs, instructional methods and policies. Students assigned to a particular building could even choose which unit they wish to attend on the basis of personal interests and/or vocational plans.

Beyond possibly correcting some of the previously-noted shortcomings characteristic of large institutions, the schools-within-schools strategy does not require the abandonment of the many recently constructed large buildings.

Although the Commission sees value in the schools-within-schools approach, this concept is offered essentially as a remedy. The Commission believes that the intention of school district reorganization was to get larger, more manageable districts, not necessarily to get larger buildings. Thus, the Commission encourages districts to think twice before undertaking the construction of huge physical plants.

Conclusion

It is appropriate that the question of school size be the last specific concern discussed in this section of the chapter.

The Commission is recommending personalized and flexible learning programs for students. What it means to be a person in the educational process has been a prime concern throughout this chapter of the report.

A concern for the person—well-being in the total sense—is a matter which cannot be expressed in short-term reform efforts. Deciding what

is the proper size of a school is not a simple matter, nor are any of the other crucial aspects of efforts to personalize educational programs any easier to resolve. The "softness" of the issues involved here requires a different mode of address than matters relating to ensuring the physical safety of children or improving school accounting procedures.

At its essence, personalizing instruction and making it more flexible is a *people concern* more than a *program concern*. The natural response to the criticisms of the students stated earlier in this chapter is to rush off and design a lot of elaborate instructional programs to replace the existing ones. But this is not the first priority.

What is most needed, as the foundation to build upon, is a sense of commitment to the welfare of children and young people translated into a concern and caring, which in turn, communicates a sense of worth to each student.

It is true that we need to engineer new approaches to instruction and curriculum. Educational technicians have a major contribution to make in improving instruction. But the spirit in which technique is carried out in the long run is probably more important than the technique itself.

Reforms of the spirit do not come easily. But such is an absolute imperative to personalizing the educational process. This Commission does not want to leave a contrary impression.

The efforts needed to make our instructional programs truly personalized and flexible are not narrowly educational issues. At heart, the Commission is addressing itself to the quality of life in this society. There is no difference between the kind of valuing of the worth of human beings required to begin the renewal of the educational system and that needed to renew the practice of medicine, the law or any other human service.

In each of these complex sets of human services, specific reforms are needed. The Commission has tried to document those needed in the schools of this Commonwealth. But the Commission believes that unless we understand this basic requirement to value the worth of people, all else will fail.

The Commission looks toward the time when the typical student will respond to the question: "How do you like school?" with the answer: "It's great. They seem to care about me as a person."

Chapter VI

Staffing

Introduction

The recommendations of the Commission will require the support of all parts of the Commonwealth for their successful implementation. However, there is an especially important role for the educators who staff our schools, since their daily behavior determines the degree to which policy is translated into substantive change. To a very great extent, these people must be directly responsible for the creation and maintenance of open, personalized and flexible learning environments. Samuel B. Gould emphasized this point in *Explorations in Non-Traditional Study*. Speaking of what has been learned from innovation on the elementary and secondary levels, he noted that the problems involve:

> . . . above all, the development of student and teacher attitudes receptive to the unorthodox approaches encompassed in the non-traditional concept and the development of student and teacher abilities to cope with such approaches.[1]

It is critical, then, that any report directed to the broad question of improving schools should also direct its attention to the needs and problems of the teachers, administrators, professional support staff and paraprofessionals within those schools.

Staffing deals in large part with the formal (preservice) preparation and continuing (in-service) education of these groups. There are difficult questions to be posed not only about the amount but also about the kind of training to be required, and about when and where it should occur. There are questions of making the profession more selective. Impinging directly on these matters are the terms under which educators are selected and serve, primarily, certification, evaluation and tenure.

Don Davies, former Associate Commissioner of the U. S. Office of Education, has argued that ". . . in the training and certification of educational personnel, we now have an opportunity for a major breakthrough."[2] If it is generally accepted that the preparation of educators

[1] Samuel B. Gould, "Prologue: Prospects for Non-Traditional Study" in *Explorations in Non-Traditional Study* (San Francisco, 1972), p. 3.

[2] *Report on Performance Based Certification of School Personnel,* Florida Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida, 1971.

needs to be improved greatly, and better support systems developed for persons already certified, the Commission believes its task to be the laying of the groundwork for change in Pennsylvania.

The recommendations which follow are not designed as an instant panacea, but as a means to the development of a more flexible, responsive educational system. This should not be construed as a desire merely for efficiency, to train teachers who can help students assimilate more, faster, and with more lucrative ends. While these goals may be worthy, the Commission's concerns are larger, and can be stated as follows: that the selection and education of educators, the certification of their abilities to fulfill a given role, and the other terms of employment should be designed to complement and support the concepts of flexible and personalized education. Throughout this chapter, the tone is one of desire for openness in education, flexibility of instruction, and increased options for students.

The direct ramifications of such a system for the behavior of educators is profound. We must remember that between the ages of five and seventeen, children spend more of their time with the faculties and staffs of schools than with any other set of adults. What they learn, not only formally, but informally through the "hidden curriculum"[3] of the school, is learned largely in response to the influence of these adults. If schools are to be open, flexible and personalized, there is a great need for teachers and administrators who can facilitate such a system and grow with it themselves.

Definitions of School Employes

The growth over the last century of services provided by schools has resulted in the addition of a number of positions to the ranks of school employes. Section 1101[4] of the School Code of Pennsylvania, entitled "Professional Employees," presently defines professional school employes as:

> . . . those who are certified as teachers, supervisors, supervising principals,[5] principals, assistant principals, vice-principals, directors of vocational education, dental hygienists, visiting teachers, home and school counselors, child-nutrition program specialists, school secretaries, the selection of whom is on the basis of merit as determined by eligibility lists and school nurses.

Not all of these positions are primarily educational in nature. Dental hygienists and school nurses, like child nutrition program specialists,

[3] See Glossary.

[4] Section 1101. *Public School Code of 1949, as amended.*

[5] The position of supervising principal was eliminated in 1971 as part of the reorganization of school districts.

perform duties more immediately directed at the child's overall health and welfare than at the learning process *per se*. Similarly, home and school visitors function as social workers for the school.

All of these services should be available to children. It may be, however, that, in assuming them to be a responsibility of the school, we are asking the school to disperse its efforts far beyond its realm of expertise.[6] A concern for the "whole child" (a term which has become popular to describe the interrelatedness of social, physical, emotional and educational factors) does not mean that all child specialists must be *educational* employes. The Commission concludes that only those people whose duties are immediately educational in nature should be considered professional *school* employes. Consequently, the Commission recommends that:

6-1.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD AMEND SECTION 1101 OF THE SCHOOL CODE TO READ:
THE TERM EDUCATIONAL EMPLOYE SHALL INCLUDE THOSE WHO ARE CERTIFIED AS TEACHERS, SUPERVISORS, PRINCIPALS, ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS, VICE-PRINCIPALS, DIRECTORS OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, VISITING TEACHERS AND SCHOOL COUNSELORS.

To clarify the meaning of this change:

6-1.1 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD CHANGE THE TITLE OF SECTION 1101 OF THE SCHOOL CODE FROM "PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES" TO "EDUCATIONAL EMPLOYEES."

It is important to emphasize here that the deletion of a position from the list of professional *school* employes in no way affects the status of that profession *qua* profession. Thus:

6-1.2 THOSE EXCLUDED FROM THIS DEFINITION SHOULD BE TREATED AS PROFESSIONALS IN AN AREA OTHER THAN EDUCATION, OR PARAPROFESSIONELS UNDER THE DEFINITION OF PARAPROFESSIONALS GIVEN IN THIS CHAPTER.[7]

Equal Opportunity Employment

Charlotte Epstein, Associate Professor of Education at Temple University, has observed that, "There is no optimum education without integrated education."[8] This pertains not only to the student body of a school district, but deals as well with the hiring and promotion of minority group members and women at all levels of the system. While the school cannot solve all of the inequities of the world at large, it can present to students an example of a multi-racial and multi-ethnic

[6] For additional discussion of this position, see the chapter on Supportive Services.

[7] See recommendations 6-15.0, 6-17.0 and accompanying discussion in this chapter.

[8] Charlotte Epstein, *Intergroup Relations for the Classroom Teacher* (Boston, 1968), p. 23.

society, and one in which members of both sexes play significant leadership roles. Anything less is unrealistic and deprives children of an important learning experience. Therefore:

6-2.0 SCHOOL BOARDS SHOULD COMMIT THEMSELVES TO FAIR EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WRITTEN TO MEET PARTICULAR NEEDS OF INDIVIDUAL PROGRAMS. SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHOULD ESTABLISH GOALS FOR THE HIRING, TRAINING AND PROMOTION OF MINORITY AND ETHNIC GROUP MEMBERS AND WOMEN AT ALL LEVELS OF EMPLOYMENT. THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE THAT THESE PROGRAMS BE A PART OF EACH DISTRICT'S LONG RANGE PLAN, THUS MAKING DISTRICTS RESPONSIBLE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FOR ATTAINMENT OF EMPLOYMENT GOALS.

The Commission is aware of the problems which may be encountered in implementing this recommendation. Recruiting racial minorities for employment in nonurban districts is frequently difficult since it may entail almost virtual cultural isolation for the minority group member. In addition, salaries in rural areas are not always competitive with those offered by city school districts. Compounding all of this is the fact that recruiters may know little or nothing about how or where to focus their recruitment efforts.

The difficulties involved in recruiting and promoting women are somewhat different, but nonetheless real. As of May 1971, the citizens of Pennsylvania adopted a state equal rights amendment. Despite this commitment to equal employment rights irrespective of sex, and although almost 60 per cent of all those involved in education in Pennsylvania are women, administration and supervision of basic educational programs are largely male-dominated. As of September, 1973, not one of the 505 school districts had a female superintendent. Even at the position of elementary principal (often thought of as a woman's position), men outnumber women four to one.

Nevertheless, a major contributing factor to lack of progress in the area of equal opportunity recruitment and promotion is often simply a lack of understanding that a problem exists. It is to this issue that the Commission addresses itself. If students are to understand that equal opportunity can be a reality, this commitment must be reflected in the employment practices of the Pennsylvania public school system.

Teachers

In *The Genius of American Education*, educational historian Lawrence Cremin maintains that, "Education is too significant and dynamic an enterprise to be left to mere technicians."[9] He insists that we must:

[9] Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Genius of American Education* (Pittsburgh, 1965), p. 59.

> begin now the prodigious task of preparing men and women who understand not only the substance of what they are teaching, but also the theories behind the particular strategies they employ to convey that substance. A society committed to the continuing intellectual, aesthetic and moral growth of all its members can ill afford less on the part of those who undertake to teach.[10]

Recent developments in teacher education in Pennsylvania have given the Commonwealth a sound start in this direction.

Requirements for certification (the professional licensure of an educator) are no longer set rigidly at the state level. Instead, under the system known as "program approval"[11] the Department of Education (in accordance with State Board of Education standards) sets general guidelines to be met by the curricula of the teacher training institutions. Within those broad limitations, programs may vary from college to college and from candidate to candidate within a school, permitting considerable flexibility in the design of an individual student's course of study. Completion of requirements in a state-approved program results in initial certification.

Most educator training institutions have adopted or are moving toward the adoption of performance-based courses of study for prospective teachers. That is, a candidate is considered to have completed the required program only after displaying knowledge and command of specified skills. The actual demonstration of skills acquired is the key to this type of program.

The certification which a teacher earns upon completion of an approved educational program is only temporary. Permanent certification comes after the successful completion of two years of employment and 24 hours of additional credits.[12]

Some education critics are extremely negative about the whole subject of certification. They agree with Ivan Illich[13] that the very assumption that a person's ability can be certified is contrary to the idea and highest goals of education.

The Commission acknowledges these reservations and recognizes that certification has not always ensured competence. Nevertheless, a system charged with the constitutional duty of educating all of the children necessarily must have authority over the people to whom it delegates its function, as well as authority to control the process by which those designated individuals are selected to exercise that function. Further,

---

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] For additional discussion of this concept, see the Governance chapter.

[12] For additional discussion of this procedure, and for recommendations pertinent to it, see pp. 63-64, 74-75 of this chapter.

[13] Ivan Illich, *Deschooling Society* (New York, 1971), *passim.*

the Commission believes that the crux of the matter is *not* the act of certification itself, but the nature of the training upon which certification depends.

The Commission believes that the developments of teacher preparation in Pennsylvania toward program approval, performance-based study, and continuing in-service education are sound steps toward strengthening the certification process by improving teacher education. Nevertheless, problems remain.

* * *

Although there was a time earlier in this century when teachers were in short supply, by the mid-sixties, Pennsylvania experienced a teacher surplus. As a result of a failure to plan or assess needs in terms of human resources, there is now a supply of people with teaching certificates which exceeds the demand in most areas of basic education. In the 1971-72 school year, 19,172 college students graduated from Pennsylvania colleges and universities prepared to teach. Of this number, only about one-half found positions.

Unfortunately, over-supply does not assure quality. The problem is not simply one of numbers, but of selectivity: we must assure a continuing flow of trained, competent people to those areas where they are needed, and maintain a balance in other areas at the same time. To meet this need, the Commission recommends that:

6-3.0 COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES SHOULD NOT ONLY IMPROVE THE PRACTICAL TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE OFFERED TO PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS, BUT SHOULD ALSO EXERCISE EVEN GREATER SELECTIVITY IN ACCEPTING EDUCATION STUDENTS AND IN APPROVING THEIR PROGRAMS. SUCH HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS SHOULD ALSO ADVISE PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS ACCURATELY ABOUT THE PROSPECTIVE JOB MARKET IN TEACHING AS COMPARED TO OTHER AREAS.

* * *

Greater care needs to be given, not only to the selection of prospective teachers, but also to the kinds of experience which make up their courses of study. The Commission heard repeatedly at meetings and in testimony at public hearings that most prospective teachers do not receive sufficient experience in the classrooms prior to accepting a full-time teaching position. For many teachers, preprofessional experience is limited to a relatively brief practicum in the senior year of college.

Allowing people to teach who have had minimal exposure to actual classroom situations—preferably good ones—is unfair both to the students and to the teacher. Potential teachers are usually deeply committed to a career choice of teaching before actually learning what teaching is all about. Schools have little choice when hiring new

faculty other than to accept relatively inexperienced people and let them learn on the job. The children who are taught by the teachers may become victims of the "luck of the draw."

The Commission believes that this situation can be handled in a positive manner to the benefit of children, schools and prospective teachers.

6-4.0 IN ITS STANDARDS FOR CERTIFICATION OF PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL PERSONNEL, THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE THAT PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS UNDERGO A SYSTEM OF RIGOROUS CLINICAL EXPERIENCE WHICH WOULD TAKE ONE OF TWO FORMS.

6-4.1 THERE SHOULD BE COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY-SPONSORED INTERNSHIPS FOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS WHO ARE PURSUING AN APPROVED EDUCATION PROGRAM THROUGHOUT THEIR UNDERGRADUATE CAREERS. THESE INTERNSHIPS WOULD TAKE PLACE IN SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS OR TEACHER CENTERS AND WOULD BE FOR ONE SCHOOL YEAR.

6-4.2 SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS, INTERMEDIATE UNITS OR TEACHER CENTERS THAT DEVELOP APPROVED PROGRAMS SHOULD SPONSOR AN ALTERNATIVE TYPE OF INTERNSHIP. THIS WOULD BE FOR PEOPLE WHO WISH TO ENTER TEACHING AND POSSESS A DEGREE OTHER THAN FROM AN APPROVED PROGRAM AND WHO HAVE HAD NO PREVIOUS TRAINING. THIS INTERNSHIP WOULD BE FOR A MINIMUM OF TWO YEARS. FOR APPROVAL SUCH A PROGRAM SHOULD, IN THE DETERMINATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, EQUAL OR EXCEED IN QUALITY ALREADY EXISTING PROGRAMS OF TEACHER EDUCATION.

6-4.3 BOTH INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS WOULD BE BASED ON A SYSTEM OF GRADUATED RESPONSIBILITY FOR TEACHING DUTIES, AND UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF CERTIFIED EDUCATORS WHO HAVE HAD SPECIALIZED TRAINING IN WORKING WITH INTERNS.

6-4.4 PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS ENROLLED IN AN APPROVED PROGRAM OF PREPARATION SHOULD BEGIN ACTUAL CLASSROOM EXPERIENCE (NOT CONFINED TO OBSERVATION) IN THE FIRST TWO YEARS OF UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOL, WITH INVOLVEMENT IN ACTUAL CLASSROOM RESPONSIBILITIES INCREASING THROUGHOUT.

To this end, teacher training institutions should implement Standard 12 of the *Policies, Procedures and Standards of Professional School Personnel*, which reads in part:

> The institution shall presem evidence of a comprehensive planned sequence of professional laboratory experience with pupils of the appropriate age groups of children when applicable to culminate in a full-time student teaching or intern assignment.[14]

* * *

[14] Standard 12, *Policies, Procedures and Standards for Certification of Professional School Personnel*. Pennsylvania Department of Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1972.
NOTE: The language of this standard should be revised to be compatible with Commission recommendations on nongradedness.

In addition to the skills to be gained through early intern experiences, the Commission has identified certain specific areas in which teachers need stronger preservice training.

Today, school children are faced with a range of problems that they will be expected to help solve when they reach adulthood: problems of consumerism, the environment, sex education and drugs. To varying degrees, these topics are now being included in school curricula. Little is being done, however, to prepare teachers—present or prospective—to manage such subjects in the classrooms, either as a special or a general skill. To an even lesser degree are teachers educated to deal with the conflicts of moral value presented by these and other such controversial issues. It is of paramount importance that teachers understand and be sensitive to the wide range of religious beliefs held by students and their parents, and that they be led by a strong sense of professional and ethical responsibility to provide a caring, nurturing atmosphere for those beliefs. Therefore, the Commission recommends that:

6-5.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE MATERIAL DEALING WITH CONTEMPORARY SOCIAL PROBLEMS TO BE INTEGRATED INTO EXISTING COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY COURSES SO THAT PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS ARE PREPARED TO DEAL WITH SUCH SUBJECTS IN ORDER TO MEET PROGRAM APPROVAL. IN ADDITION, IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS SHOULD BE DEVELOPED TO PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS ABILITY AMONG TEACHERS CURRENTLY CERTIFIED.

Education in the areas of interpersonal relations and intergroup relations is one of the school's most important tasks. As teachers play the major roles in facilitating this type of learning, it is essential that they receive training to develop skills in these areas. This is especially so, since the opportunity to help in such things as attitude development, building healthy self-concepts and appreciating differences can only, in many situations, be taken advantage of through the teacher's skill and ability, regardless of the subject matter at hand.

6-5.1 EACH TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTION SHOULD FULLY IMPLEMENT STANDARD 14 OF THE *POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS FOR CERTIFICATION OF PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL PERSONNEL*, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROGRAM APPROVAL GUIDELINES DEVELOPED FOR THAT STANDARD AND APPROVED BY THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION.

Standard 14 reads: "The program shall include intergroup content and experiences which encourage intellectual awareness of and emotional sensitivity to the cultural pluralism of our schools and society."[15]

[15] Standard 14, *Policies, Procedures and Standards of Certification of Professional School Personnel*, Pennsylvania Department of Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1972.

6-5.2 EACH TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTION SHOULD PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR ITS FACULTY IN THE AREAS OF INTERPERSONAL AND INTERGROUP RELATIONS.

Finally, the Commission recognizes that teachers serve not just the school, but the community in general, and should not see themselves and the school as isolated from the community.

6-5.3 TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS SHOULD INCLUDE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS TO ACQUIRE THE SKILL AND KNOWLEDGE NECESSARY TO WORK IN A COMMUNITY AS WELL AS IN A SCHOOL.

* * *

Quality instruction in schools depends, however, on more than the nature of teacher preparation programs. Equally important are the conditions under which prospective teachers enter the field and the terms under which they function as professional employes. The central issues here are certification, in-service education, tenure and evaluation.[16]

It has been pointed out earlier in this chapter that the earning of permanent (Level II) certification is tied to participation in 24 semester hours of study beyond the completion of an approved undergraduate program. The reason for this is to make permanent certification dependent upon continuing professional growth. Originally, such study had to be taken at colleges or universities. Prior to 1972, that restriction was relaxed to permit teachers to take half of their in-service requirement in their local school district. Part of the intention here was to allow in-service programs to be developed to meet specific local needs. In September, 1972, the State Board of Education approved a new regulation[17] allowing teachers to take all 24 semester hours through either the district or the cooperating college or a combination of both.

The Commission supports the principle of joining certification to continuous professional growth. It does not believe, however, that the validity of such interrelatedness ends after 24 hours of in-service education. Moreover, if the original training program has developed desired skills (to which end the Commission has made recommendations 6-3.0 through 6-5.3), and if professional growth is a process which occurs on a permanent, ongoing basis, there is no logical necessity for the present distinction between Level I and Level II certificates. Consequently:

---

[16] For the purposes of clarity, all recommendations concerning evaluation have been placed together. See pp. 72-76 in this chapter.

[17] *School Administrators Memorandum 557*, issued October 23, 1972, and titled "Approval of In-service Activities for Certification Credit" sets forth the guidelines whereby this procedure may be implemented.

6-6.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD ELIMINATE LEVEL II CERTIFICATES FOR ALL SCHOOL PERSONNEL AND MAKE THE CONTINUED VALIDITY OF THE LEVEL I CERTIFICATE CONTINGENT UPON PARTICIPATION IN CONTINUOUS IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS.[18]

The Commission is hopeful that this change will put in-service education on a new motivational basis. The linking of job security to self-improvement should enhance the quality of educational staffing, particularly since the need for contact with new ideas surely does not end with the completion of an arbitrary number of hours of post-certification study.

For this change to be fully effective, however, and for the Commonwealth to reap the full educational benefits, schools must develop staffing patterns which assure teachers of instructional opportunities to utilize newly-gained skills. Presently, there are few such opportunities between the classroom and the administrative suite. Many good teachers are lost to children because of insufficient reward (either financial or in status) for remaining in the classroom. Unfortunately, there being no clear correlation between being a good teacher and being a good administrator, children may not only lose good teachers but gain poor administrators. For these and other reasons, the Commission advocates that schools investigate the feasibility of staffing patterns which allow teachers to advance both in terms of responsibility and salary, as their skills increase, without leaving the position of teacher.

* * *

Closely allied to the question of certification is that of tenure. Article XI, Section 1121 of the *Public School Code of 1949, as amended*, states that, ". . . each board of school directors . . . shall hereafter enter into contracts, in writing, with each professional employe who has satisfactorily completed two (2) years of service in any school district of this Commonwealth." It further provides that "none of the provisions of this act may be waived either orally or in writing, and that this contract shall continue in force year after year, . . ."

Tenure was designed to provide job security for the competent professional educator, as well as a degree of academic freedom. The question has been: Does tenure tend to "lock in" incompetent teachers and prevent the movement of staff so that competent ones may be hired? In addition, the advent of collective bargaining for public employes under Act 195, as well as the use of the due process clause of the United States Constitution, has caused critics of tenure to state that tenure is no longer necessary.

---

[18] See Supportive Services chapter for additional discussion of in-service activities.

The consensus of the Commission is that some reform of tenure practices would facilitate the achievement of its overall objectives. It is also realized that this topic generates extreme controversy. The Commission believes radical reform or abolition of tenure could be counterproductive to the betterment of education in the Commonwealth.

Most discussions of tenure tend to center on the alleged retention of incompetent teachers. There is another side of the coin, however, and the case is succinctly made in a publication of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) titled *Teacher Tenure Ain't the Problem:*

> Weaknesses in both the concept and the application of teacher tenure laws have been made more glaring by careless or nonexistent evaluation of teacher performance. This laxity has occurred for at least two reasons. First, out of indolence, fear or lack of imagination, . . . the profession of education [has] failed to develop and utilize adequate measures of teacher performance based on objective statements of what is expected of teachers . . . In addition, many administrators have been discouraged from attempting to evaluate and apply the evaluative results to decisions about retention of teachers after the probationary period because of a feeling of futility.[19]

While the concept of tenure does not really seem in keeping with contemporary education, which is one of rapid change, the AASA booklet reminds us that, "We don't want to make it easy to fire teachers." It must be kept in mind that the attainment of statutory tenure does not mean a teacher cannot be removed from his or her position. It does mean that school superintendents must see that every effort is made to help a teacher who is performing unsatisfactorily, and to see that fair and positive evaluations are made of teacher performance.

With the foregoing in mind, the following recommendations are offered regarding tenure for teachers:

6-7.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD CONTINUE TO GRANT TENURE FOLLOWING THE COMPLETION OF TWO YEARS OF SATISFACTORY SERVICE IN A SCHOOL DISTRICT, BUT ADMINISTRATORS SHOULD RECOGNIZE A CLEAR RESPONSIBILITY TO PERFORM THOROUGH EVALUATIONS.

6-7.1 DECISIONS NOT TO CONTINUE THE EMPLOYMENT OF UNTENURED TEACHERS SHOULD BE BASED ON DOCUMENTED EVALUATION REPORTS INCLUDING ANECDOTAL RECORDS AND OFFERS OF ASSISTANCE THAT DID NOT RESULT IN SATISFACTORY IMPROVEMENT. ANECDOTAL RECORDS SHOULD BE CURRENT AND PERIODICALLY SHARED WITH RESPECTIVE TEACHERS FOR PURPOSES OF ACCURACY AND SELF-IMPROVEMENT.

---

[19] *Teacher Tenure Ain't the Problem,* American Association of School Administrators, Arlington, Virginia, 1973.

6-7.2 SHOULD AN UNTENURED TEACHER LEAVE ONE DISTRICT FOR ANOTHER, THE RECEIVING DISTRICT SHOULD EMPLOY HIM OR HER PROBATIONARILY FOR A PERIOD OF TWO YEARS.

6-7.3 SHOULD A TENURED TEACHER LEAVE ONE DISTRICT FOR ANOTHER, THE RECEIVING DISTRICT SHOULD EMPLOY HIM OR HER PROBATIONARILY FOR A PERIOD OF ONE YEAR.

6-7.4 A DISTRICT EMPLOYING A TENURED TEACHER ABSENT FROM TEACHING FOR MORE THAN ONE YEAR SHOULD EMPLOY HIM OR HER PROBATIONARILY FOR A PERIOD OF TWO YEARS. APPROVED LEAVES OF ABSENCE SHOULD BE EXCEPTED FROM THE ABOVE.

Only upon the completion of the probationary period should a determination on the resolution or denial of tenure be made.

Administrators

It seems apparent that the school administrator may be the most important single individual in a school building, for this is the person who has the single greatest and most direct impact on the policy, tone and mood of a school. As Seymour A. Sarason said in *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change:*

> . . . the principal is the crucial implementor of change. That is to say, any proposal for change that intends to alter the quality of life in the school depends primarily on the principal. One can realign forces of power, change administrative structures and increase budgets for materials and new personnel, but the intended effects of all these changes will be drastically diluted by principals whose past experiences and training, interacting with certain personality factors, ill prepares them for the role of educational and intellectual leader. In fact, and this point has tended to be overlooked, many of the intended outcomes of the proposed changes could have been achieved by the principal before these proposals ever were made or became matters of official policy.[20]

Indeed, if the school is to be an open place where a higher value is put upon the unique learning styles of individuals than on the problem-free operation of a fixed system, the school administrator must provide strong instructional as well as managerial leadership.[21]

This kind of leadership involves more than simply being a good teacher who can delegate administrative tasks efficiently. Among many other talents, it requires the ability to know clearly how a seemingly perfunctory administrative decision can affect instructional practice and the skill to discover administrative alternatives where they are

---

[20] Seymour B. Sarason, *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change* (New Jersey, 1971), pp. 148-49.

[21] Because the Commission assigns such high priority to this dual function of the school administrator, the role of school administrator is discussed in the chapter on Management as well as in this section.

indicated. It necessitates an understanding, and ability to make constructive use of, the delicate balance of forces—social and political, as well as educational—which come into play in a public school system.

However, many administrators come to their positions ill-prepared to manage these various functions successfully. Most administrators come from the teaching ranks. Very few prospective school principals have in-depth administrative experience prior to assuming a position. Many serve as assistant or acting principal until the occasion arises for them to assume greater responsibility. While this results in "on-the-job training," most of these new principals have already been certified as principals before gaining meaningful experience. In some instances, full principalship is conferred on persons who have completed the requisite number of teaching years and required hours of graduate work, but who have had no actual experience. As a result of such practices, our schools sometimes tend to institutionalize the "Peter Principle."

The Commission believes that one step in the direction of providing schools with better administrators is to urge the inclusion of extensive clinical experiences in the preservice training of administrators.

6-8.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD INCLUDE IN THE *POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS FOR CERTIFICATION OF PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL PERSONNEL* A STANDARD WHICH WOULD STIPULATE THE NEED FOR RIGOROUS CLINICAL EXPERIENCES FOR PROSPECTIVE ADMINISTRATORS. UNDER THE SYSTEM OF PROGRAM APPROVAL, THIS WOULD NECESSITATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF SUCH EXPERIENCES ON THE PART OF THE TRAINING INSTITUTIONS IF THEY WISH TO OPERATE AN APPROVED PROGRAM.

6-8.1 ADMINISTRATOR TRAINING INSTITUTIONS SHOULD CONDUCT INTERNSHIPS FOR PROSPECTIVE ADMINISTRATORS. THESE INTERNSHIPS SHOULD BE CONDUCTED IN SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND CONSIST OF A VARIETY OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCES WITH GRADUATED RESPONSIBILITIES.

6-8.2 THE TRAINING INSTITUTIONS, THE HOST DISTRICT AND THE PROSPECTIVE ADMINISTRATORS SHOULD AGREE ON SPECIFIC COMPETENCIES TO BE ATTAINED BY THE INTERN DURING THE INTERNSHIP. SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION OF THE INTERNSHIP WOULD DEPEND UPON DEMONSTRATED MASTERY OF THE AGREED-UPON COMPETENCIES.

Compatible with these recommendations, and the belief that administrators should provide instructional leadership, is the Commission's recommendation (7-1.0) that the teaching experience requirement for principals should be retained.

* * *

The value of preservice education is tempered by the growth which occurs after professional service has begun. For that reason, the Commission has made a number of recommendations concerning the in-service education of teachers.[22] However, in-service activities for administrators, although often neglected, are no less important. Particularly as the Commonwealth's system of public education moves toward greater flexibility, it is crucial that administrators have regular opportunities to discuss and evaluate change, hear the opinions of other educators, and devise strategies for educational improvement in conjunction with the advice and experience of their peers. The value of such forums cannot be underestimated.

Nevertheless, up to the present time the Commonwealth has operated no such in-service system for its school administrators. Consequently, the Commission urges the creation of an in-service structure to assist public school administrators in updating and strengthening their professional skills.

6-9.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD PURSUE, AS A PRIORITY, THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ADMINISTRATORS ACADEMY. SUCH AN ACADEMY SHOULD BE RESPONSIVE TO CURRENT PROBLEMS AND SUPPLEMENT PRECERTIFICATION PROGRAMS.

The Pennsylvania Secretary of Education has already demonstrated his enthusiasm for this concept. The Commission supports his efforts to establish an in-service structure which will permit administrators to come together periodically to work intensively and in considerable depth on actual district problems.

* * *

The general public may not fully realize that tenure applies to "each professional employe" and not just to teachers. Indeed, the matter of tenure is just as central, if not so openly controversial, to the question of good administration as it is to good instructional programs. Even though most discussion centers on the supposed incompetence of some tenured teachers, it would seem naive to assume greater frequency of incompetence at the teaching level than on the administrative level.

The effect of Article XI, Section 1121 of the School Code[23] on school administrators is that an individual leaving teaching for an administrative position carries with him his tenured status as a teacher. That is, administrative personnel may carry with them tenure earned in another and very different job, that of teacher. The weakness of this practice is that different competencies are necessary to perform in an

[22] See this chapter, pp. 62-64, and the Supportive Services chapter.

[23] Cited on p. 64 in this chapter.

administrative capacity than those required to function in a teaching role. Thus, the Commission feels that certain amendments to the existing tenure law would help ensure competence at the administrative level and maintain competency at the teaching level.

The following recommendations pertain only to administrators serving below the level of district superintendent:

6-10.0 TENURED TEACHERS WHO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE A PROGRAM OF ADMINISTRATIVE TRAINING, INCLUDING A ONE-YEAR INTERNSHIP, WOULD, UPON GAINING CERTIFICATION, BE GIVEN EMPLOYMENT AS FULL-TIME ADMINISTRATORS AND, SATISFACTORILY COMPLETING THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD, LOSE THEIR TENURED STATUS AS TEACHERS AND BE GRANTED TENURE AS ADMINISTRATORS.

It is not intended that this recommendation should affect administrators currently on probation (see Recommendations 6-10.1 through 6-10.3) or already tenured.

6-10.1 SHOULD AN UNTENURED ADMINISTRATOR LEAVE ONE DISTRICT FOR ANOTHER, THE RECEIVING DISTRICT SHOULD EMPLOY HIM OR HER PROBATIONARILY FOR A PERIOD OF TWO YEARS.

6-10.2 SHOULD A TENURED ADMINISTATOR LEAVE ONE DISTRICT FOR ANOTHER. THE RECEIVING DISTRICT SHOULD EMPLOY HIM OR HER PROBATIONARILY FOR A PERIOD OF ONE YEAR.

6-10.3 A DISTRICT EMPLOYING A TENURED ADMINISTRATOR ABSENT FROM EDUCATION FOR MORE THAN ONE YEAR SHOULD EMPLOY HIM OR HER PROBATIONARILY FOR A PERIOD OF TWO YEARS. APPROVED LEAVES OF ABSENCE SHOULD BE EXPECTED FROM THE ABOVE.

As with teachers, a determination on the restoration or denial of tenure for administrators should be made only after the completion of the probationary period.

Alternative Certification Routes

Throughout its report, the Commission has been concerned with openness and flexibility in the Pennsylvania public school system. These two traits take on many forms; in this chapter alone, they have led the Commission to make recommendations on such wide-ranging matters as teacher employment patterns and administrative in-service programs. The interests of educational openness and flexibility would not be fully served, however, if the Commission failed to give consideration to alternate entry routes into educational positions.

Frequently, the work of professional supportive staff (*e.g.*, some counseling tasks, planning activities and financial responsibilities) and of school administrators have close parallels in noneducational careers.

The Commission believes that here, as with the broader inclusion of the community in school affairs,[24] our educational system must be able to take advantage of available experience and expertise. Regular certification procedures do not always permit this, since they may not formally recognize relevant training gained in another field. Making the transition from a noneducational field to education, then, might well entail "starting all over"—in spite of valuable and pertinent knowledge already acquired. As a result, good people, advanced in their own careers, are understandably hesitant to make the sacrifices required for entry into education.

In consequence of these considerations, the Commission makes the following recommendations:

6-11.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION REGULATION WHICH REQUIRES A PERSON TO HAVE A MINIMUM OF THREE YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE BEFORE BECOMING ELIGIBLE FOR THE POSITION OF SUPERINTENDENT SHOULD BE RETAINED. HOWEVER, THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION SHOULD HAVE THE POWER TO WAIVE THIS REQUIREMENT UPON PETITION OF THE DISTRICT IN APPROPRIATE CIRCUMSTANCES.

6-12.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD ESTABLISH AND CLOSELY MONITOR A HIGHLY SELECTIVE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM WHICH WOULD FACILITATE THE ENTRY AND TRANSITION OF HIGHLY SKILLED PEOPLE FROM OTHER FIELDS INTO PROFESSIONAL SUPPORTIVE POSITIONS AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO TRADITIONAL CERTIFICATION ROUTES. SUCH INTERNSHIPS SHOULD NOT BE OPEN TO THOSE SEEKING PRINCIPALSHIPS AND/OR SUPERINTENDENCIES.

Precedent for such "alternate entry routes" exists and is working well in the State Board of Education regulation which permits qualified but noncertified personnel to teach up to 300 hours a year in Pennsylvania's schools.[25] This Commission has gone even further in providing for an alternative entry route for teachers(Recommendation 6-4.2).

Paraprofessionals

The Commission feels that the training and use of paraprofessionals is an important concern,[26] since the number of people hired in paraprofessional capacities increases each year, with many of them in close, daily contact with the children.

The definition of paraprofessional used by the Commission is one put forth by the Department of Education in its publication, *Guidelines*

---

[24] See Supportive Services chapter.

[25] Title 22. Pennsylvania Code. Section 49.62. Chapter 49, Professional Personnel, adopted by the State Board of Education March 13, 1970.

[26] See Supportive Services chapter.

for Program Development, Employment and Utilization of Educational Paraprofessionals. It is as follows:

> The term "paraprofessional" shall mean a noncertified person who works for the certified professional staff in a support capacity (noninstructional aide), or one who works beside a professional teacher in a support role in the instructional setting (instructional aide).[27]

The proper use of paraprofessionals to strengthen instruction requires that they be assigned only to tasks for which they are clearly and specifically qualified. Consequently:

6-13.0 SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHOULD ENDORSE THE POSITION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION THAT IT IS "ESSENTIAL THAT PARAPROFESSIONALS POSSESS THE SKILLS, COMPETENCIES AND ATTITUDES REQUIRED TO PERFORM IN A DEFINED JOB PRIOR TO PERFORMANCE IN THAT JOB."[28] THE COMMISSION ALSO AGREES THAT BOTH THE JOB DEFINITION AND THE NATURE OF THE PRESERVICE TRAINING SHOULD BE A LOCAL AGENCY RESPONSIBILITY.

As with preservice training, paraprofessionals must be involved in in-service training. Most of the instructional aides should be able to participate in the same programs as the professional staff. It is important that paraprofessionals be trained in accordance with the needs of the school district where they are employed, so that they may be utilized most effectively.

6-14.0 THE DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS SHOULD REMAIN UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICT EMPLOYING THEM.

By definition, paraprofessionals are not included in the provisions of the tenure law. While paraprofessionals should enjoy the same rights and benefits as professional staff, they should serve at the pleasure of the employing district.

6-15.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD NOT EXTEND TENURE COVERAGE TO PARAPROFESSIONALS.

Evaluation

A recurrent theme of this report is the Commision's belief that learning is a process which, to a significant degree, can be planned and measured. This being so, it is both possible and critically important

---

[27] *Guidelines for Program Development, Employment and Utilization of Educational Paraprofessionals.* Pennsylvania Department of Education, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1972.

[28] *Ibid.*

that the effectiveness of school personnel, both teachers and administrators, be evaluated on a regular basis and in a constructive way.

This need is recognized in Article XI, Section 1123 of the School Laws of Pennsylvania, which states in part:

> . . . the professional employee or temporary professional employee shall be rated by an approved rating system which shall give due consideration to personality, preparation, technique and pupil reaction, in accordance with standards and regulations for such scoring as defined by rating cards to be prepared by the Department of [Education].
>
> . . . Rating shall be done by or under the supervision of the superintendent of schools. . . .[29]

The General Assembly's responsibility to provide leadership in the on-going evaluation, as well as the initial certification, of school staff derives from its Constitutional obligations.

It is doubtful, however, that the particular form of evaluation required by law—that is, Department of Education rating cards—adequately meets the highest and best objectives of an evaluation system. Indeed, it is doubtful that any evaluation developed *exclusively* by one person or agency and applied to another can be completely honest or fair, and it is most certain that one based on the idea of "rating" would not be perceived as fair or meaningful. Such a system runs a strong risk of becoming either a perfunctory exercise of local school administration or a weapon of punitive control. For these reasons, the Commission recommends that:

6-16.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD AMEND SECTION 1123 OF THE SCHOOL CODE OF PENNSYLVANIA TO ELIMINATE THE RATING CARDS PREPARED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

* * *

Nevertheless, one of the ways in which the state provides leadership in the governance of the educational system is to establish standards of excellence for the operation of the educational system. The adoption of the Ten Goals of Quality Education by the State Board is an example of this kind of leadership. An area of school operations which could benefit from this type of leadership is the evaluation of the effectiveness of administrators and teachers in the schools of the Commonwealth.

Presently, the regular evaluation of teachers and administrators is the responsibility of the district superintendent of schools or his desig-

---

[29] Section 1123. *Public School Code of 1949, as amended.*

nated agent. Department of Education personnel do not perform this task. This would neither be feasible nor desirable. But there is a type of formal leadership which the staff could exercise to exert a positive influence on this crucial process. The Commonwealth could provide a minimum set of criteria to serve as the basis for evaluation of professional educators. This would provide a common foundation upon which school districts could build their own criteria for evaluation. This approach would fill the vacuum the lack of statewide standards has created. Such state standards would help prevent the worst forms of abuse in the evaluations of educators. It is necessary that the Commonwealth provide leadership in this area if its general interests are not to be neglected. Therefore:

6-17.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD ESTABLISH MINIMUM CRITERIA TO BE EMPLOYED IN TEACHER PERFORMANCE EVALUATION.

and:

6-18.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD ESTABLISH MINIMUM CRITERIA TO BE EMPLOYED IN ADMINISTRATOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION.

In order to carry out the intent of these recommendations, the State Board of Education should direct the Secretary of Education to convene a statewide committee of school board members, administrators, teachers, parents and students to develop the proposed list of minimum criteria to be used in these two kinds of evaluations. These two lists of criteria should then be reviewed, revised if necessary, and adopted by the State Board and issued to all school districts for their guidance in conducting the required evaluations. Each school district should have the freedom to add any additional criteria to the state approved list provided that the district consulted with the same wide range of interest groups in its local community that the State Board conferred with in developing its position.

The establishment of the State Board criteria for evaluation of teachers and administrators would do much to increase confidence in the system by encouraging greater rigor in the evaluation of professional educators. The suggestion for adding local items to the criteria list at the district level grows out of this Commission's desire simultaneously to ensure a high degree of equality of opportunity in education and to operate a system which is as flexible as possible.

* * *

Desire for state-level educational accountability need not preclude the primary use of evaluations for constructive improvement on the local level. A proper use of evaluations can indicate to both the local

school board and its constituents the effectiveness of the schools' staff and staffing patterns. Indeed, the Commission believes that few matters rank higher among the general concerns of citizens than this one. For that reason, the Commission recommends that:

6-19.0 THE DISTRICT'S PLAN FOR TEACHER EVALUATION MUST BE ON FILE IN EACH PRINCIPAL'S OFFICE, AVAILABLE TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC.

and:

6-20.0 A COPY OF THE DISTRICT'S PLAN FOR THE EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS MUST BE ON FILE IN THE DISTRICT'S CENTRAL OFFICE AND BE AVAILABLE TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC.

These plans should state the philosophy of evaluation which the district seeks to implement in the evaluation process, as well as the specific techniques which will be used. The more the school board does in documenting the strategies and policies which it is seeking to implement, the easier it will be for the district to continue to have the support of its citizens.

* * *

The district's philosophy of evaluation should always be aimed at the goal of positive self-improvement for school staff, and the specific procedures used should reflect this goal. The Commission believes that this can best be ensured, and bona fide concerns for accountability best served, if a wide range of community and school groups participate in the designing of the process. Consequently:

6-21.0 THROUGH APPROPRIATE REPRESENTATION, ALL ELEMENTS OF THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM AND THE COMMUNITY SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN DESIGNING THE EVALUATION PROCESSES FOR BOTH TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS.

The principle of involvement should be parallel to that used by the State Board of Education in developing its minimum evaluative criteria. Teachers, administrators, students, the school board, citizens advisory councils, and citizens at large as well as recognized interest groups should all be included.

An additional trait of an evaluation system which is to be used for self-improvement is that it should be tied to the concept of on-going professional growth. The Commission has recommended that continued certification be based upon evidence of such growth. To realize the full intent of this recommendation, the Commission further recommends that:

6-21.1 A PART OF ANY EVALUATIVE CRITERIA ESTABLISHED SHOULD BE EVIDENCE OF PARTICIPATION IN IN-SERVICE ACTIVITIES AS OUTLINED IN RECOMMENDATION 6-8.0 OF THIS REPORT.

Without this follow-up, the elimination of the 24-hour in-service requirement is meaningless.

* * *

The Commission believes that the evaluation of administrators should also be closely tied to the objectives of the school district as a whole. In this way, the administrator's relationship to the district is analogous to that of the teacher to a single class. Such yearly district-wide objectives should be published so that citizens can be aware of them. For these reasons, the Commission recommends that:

6-21.2 THE STATE BOARD SHOULD REQUIRE, PRIOR TO EACH SCHOOL YEAR, SCHOOL DISTRICT ADMINISTRATORS TO STATE THEIR PROJECTED OBJECTIVES FOR THAT YEAR. THESE OBJECTIVES SHOULD BE USED AS AN AID IN PERFORMING EVALUATIONS OF EACH ADMINISTRATOR AND SUPERVISOR. THERE SHOULD BE NO LESS THAN TWO SUCH EVALUATIONS PER PERSON ANNUALLY.

The discipline required to set down in writing yearly objectives will facilitate the development of the idea of educational accountability in the district. Having these objectives stated in writing and developing them in a process which involves the deliberation of the various levels of management in the system should avoid the current haphazard approach to the evaluation of administrators.

* * *

If the evaluation process is to lead to constructive growth, the involvement of the person most directly affected by the outcome, the individual being evaluated, is essential. So long as this person is substantively excluded from the ultimate process of designing the system, that is, so long as the procedures are totally imposed from an external source, it is unreasonable to expect evaluation results to lead to meaningful self-improvement and, through that, to the overall strengthening of the school. Based upon these conclusions, the Commission recommends that:

6-22.0 IN THE EVALUATION OF BOTH TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS, THE PERSON WHO IS TO BE EVALUATED SHOULD HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO HELP SET PERFORMANCE GOALS WITH THE PERSON ULTIMATELY RESPONSIBLE FOR PERFORMING THE EVALUATION. THESE PERFORMANCE GOALS SHOULD BE SET FOR EACH SCHOOL YEAR, AND SHOULD INCLUDE AS A BASIS THE MINIMUM CRITERIA ESTABLISHED BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION. THE EVALUATION SHOULD BE COMPLETED ONLY AFTER CONSIDERATION OF OPINIONS FROM STUDENTS, TEACHERS, AND OTHER PERSONS INVOLVED IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS.

Sound personnel practice requires that the results of evaluations be discussed with those evaluated.

* * *

To ensure effective performance and constructive self-development of the entire range of educational employes, paraprofessionals must also be evaluated.

6-23.0 BOTH THE SUPERVISING, CERTIFIED PROFESSIONAL AND THE PARAPROFESSIONAL SHOULD BE INVOLVED IN EVALUATIONS OF THE PARAPROFESSIONAL. CRITERIA FOR JOB PERFORMANCE SHOULD BE SET AND SUBSEQUENT ANALYSIS MADE OF THE COMPETENCIES DISPLAYED IN PERFORMANCE OF THE TASKS.

Above all, evaluation procedures should be couched in terms of the employe's contribution to the education of children and should, therefore, be reflective of the educational values of openness, flexibility and personalization.

Conclusion

What has been proposed in this chapter is a partial blueprint for the improvement of the staffing of our schools. If these recommendations are implemented, changes will occur that would prove beneficial, both directly and indirectly, to students.

No matter what is proposed to improve education through staffing, the ultimate results can only be mechanical changes without some very human variables being added to the formula. Educators, be they teachers, administrators, professional support staff, or paraprofessionals, must *want* to be involved in a child-centered environment which gives primary attention to the growth and self-development of the individual. Attitudes of teachers and other educators are critical in the successful implementation of educational change. The Commission's attempts to make Pennsylvania's schools more open and responsive to the needs of individual students and more flexible in organizing to meet those needs depend heavily upon the commitment to such concepts by the educators who staff our schools.

Chapter VII

Management

Introduction

Educational research indicates that administrators should be the key figures in the creation and maintenance of school morale and in the development of new programs and policies.[1] If administrators—superintendents and principals especially—are to be agents of change in the public schools, then their roles, powers and functions must be given serious attention.

The public deserves school management which will use public funds effectively, maintain a vigilant eye on the quality of instruction and plan for future educational needs systematically and democratically. Teachers deserve administrators who can intelligently and sympathetically evaluate instructional efforts and who will act as cooperative problem-solvers rather than as commanders. Students deserve a chance to learn in healthy, invigorating environments and to see firm but humane leadership exercised first hand.

Effective educational management requires administrators who understand the learning characteristics of children; who know how fatiguing and monotonous teaching can be; who can identify instructional and personal problems and then marshal available human and/or financial resources to correct such situations. The administrator must be an exemplar of democratic values by attempting to turn painful conflict into personal and institutional growth.[2] Finally, administrators must have an understanding of and the courage to deal with the political life of their communities. As former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, John W. Gardner has said:

> The future of public education will not be determined by public need alone. It will be determined by those who can translate public need into public policy—by schoolmen in politics. Since the quality of our society rests in large measure upon the quality of our public education, a widespread recognition that schoolmen must be not only aware of politics, but influential in politics, may be the key to our survival as a free and civilized nation.[3]

---

[1] Averch, Carroll, Donaldson, Kiesling, and Pincus, *How Effective Is Schooling? A Critical Review and Synthesis of Research Findings* (Santa Monica, 1972) pp. 97-98.

[2] See Kenneth D. Benne, "Authority in Education." Reprinted from *Harvard Educational Review*, LX, 3 (August, 1970), 407.

[3] As quoted by Archies R. Dykes, "The Emergent Role of Administrators and the Implications for Teacher-Administrator Relationships," *Eric Report*, ED 011 700 (1966), p. 29.

This variety of constituencies, requirements and responsibilities places the public school administrator squarely in the middle of school life—precisely where administrators ought to be. The need for intelligent and courageous human judgments can never be eliminated from educational affairs. A certain degree of conflict and confusion is a given feature of the human condition and will not be eliminated by even the most sophisticated planning and developmental models, as necesary and helpful as such models may be. Schools may be viewed as systems and sub-systems for purposes of analysis; but to children, teachers, administrators and parents, schools are not the rational abstractions and concepts of the sociologist or systems analyst. Schools are places where people spend some of the most important moments of their lives; where, to varying degrees, their destinies are shaped and their characters established. Beneath the regular and ordered surface of much of school life are important emotional currents of hopes, fears and aspirations. There will always be a need for administrators who can bring together in purposeful action the very different outlooks of the social scientist and the child. Leadership requires the abilities and faculties of the whole person, and the need for such leadership cannot be eliminated from human life.

Section 702 of the Pennsylvania Public Employe Relations Act (Act 195) defines "matters of inherent managerial policy" to include such subjects as "the functions and programs of the public employer, standards of services, the overall budget, utilization of technology, the organizational structure and the selection and direction of personnel."

This definition of management was established to exclude certain important aspects of school life from the collective bargaining process. Thus, Act 195 construes management very broadly, including subjects which the Commission has dealt with under the headings of Governance, Staffing, and Organization for Instruction. Management has been defined by the Commission to include certain questions relating to the professional standards, relationships and functions of administrators; planning, operations and evaluation; the use and quality of physical facilities; and organizational relationships and structures.

While this view of management is more modest than that described in Act 195, the Commission recognizes the vital purpose and role of administration in any human organization or institution: "to provide the coordination and the leadership necessary for the achievement of the goals for which the organization exists."[4] Thus, administrators must not allow themselves to become mere functionaries. They must not hide in the central office nor bury themselves in paperwork. Prin-

[4] Dykes, p. 24.

cipals especially must be in the classroom or in conference with teachers and department heads as much as possible—administrators must be nothing less than educational leaders if the quality of basic education is to improve.

Personnel

Perhaps the most vital and sensitive aspect of school management is that of evaluating the performances of professional employes.[5] As the cost of public education has increased, and with the appearance of books and studies charging that schools serve more of a custodial, rather than an educational function,[6] there has been a public cry for "accountability" in education.[7] All too often, the public thinks that teachers should be held accountable for the achievement of students (as measured by standardized tests) in much the same way that a plant manager can be held accountable for the number of television sets or cars his factory produces. Clearly, the analogy between schools and factories is limited at best. Professor Arthur Combs, of the University of Florida, argues that teachers cannot be held accountable for:

> . . . the behavior of students five years from now; too many others have had their fingers in that pie. The teacher's influence on all but the simplest, most primitive forms of student behavior even in his own classroom cannot be easily established.[8]

This does not mean that professional educators cannot be evaluated. While the general level of students' achievement indicates the effectiveness of the school as a whole, evaluation of individual teachers should focus more on the extent to which teachers and administrators fulfill professional responsibilities and meet standards of professional conduct.[9]

If an evaluation system is to be successful, the person performing the evaluation must have the respect of those whose efforts are being re-

---

[5] See Staffing chapter for additional discussion of the evaluation of professional employes.

[6] Jonathan Kozol's *Death At An Early Age* (Boston, 1967) is a serious indictment of the Boston public schools. Kozol charges that system with failure to educate its children, depicting many of its schools as places of detention and incarceration rather than houses of learning.

[7] The attempt to impose industrial and business management models and methods such as Planned Program Budgeting Systems and Management By Objectives on school administration is a direct result of the public's desire to make schools more easily accountable and fiscally responsible.

[8] Arthur W. Combs, *Educational Accountability: Beyond Behavioral Objectives* (Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1972), p. 34.

[9] Combs lists five key criteria for evaluating professional educators: (a) being informed in subject matter, (b) showing concern for the welfare of students, (c) understanding child psychology, (d) understanding the educational purposes to be achieved, (e) employing appropriate instructional methods in the pursuit of educational goals.

viewed. The evaluator should be a person with substantial educational experience if he is to maintain credibility with teachers. Few teachers wish to be evaluated by someone who has never experienced the difficulties of the classroom world first hand. Therefore:

7-1.0 THE TEACHING EXPERIENCE REQUIREMENT FOR PRINCIPALS SHOULD BE RETAINED. PRINCIPALS MUST BE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS AND NOT SIMPLY BUILDING MANAGERS.

* * *

Additionally, it is imperative that each employe know precisely what his or her responsibilities are. Therefore:

7-2.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE EVERY SCHOOL DISTRICT TO HAVE JOB DESCRIPTIONS FOR EACH POSITION AND ORGANIZATION CHARTS AND TO KEEP THEM UPDATED.

* * *

Superintendents are legally responsible for the evaluation of professional employes; however, principals are in a better position to evaluate the teachers and other employes in their schools. Thus:

7-3.0 SCHOOL BOARDS SHOULD HOLD SUPERINTENDENTS ACCOUNTABLE FOR REQUIRING EACH PRINCIPAL TO CONDUCT A MINIMUM OF TWO EVALUATIONS OF EACH PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYE IN HIS OR HER SCHOOL PER YEAR.

Preferably, this would mean that there would be an initial meeting between the principal and the person to be evaluated prior to the beginning of the school year to set performance goals followed by a mid-year and end-of-year evaluation.

* * *

Evaluation should help professional employes learn about themselves and their efforts. It should also, however, attempt to identify those individuals whose consistently superior performance merits special rewards. The principle of merit pay and/or merit bonuses is one that can and should be accepted by all segments of the school community and the public. Merit pay and/or bonuses are proper subjects for negotiation at the local level. While many merit programs in the past have failed, it has often been due to the fact that participation in the program was forced on the employe. At least one district in Pennsylvania has negotiated an optional merit program for instructional staff which has a high level of participation and which seems generally satisfactory.[10] Merit pay accountability schemes for administrators are also in effect and should be encouraged.[11] If statewide minimum evalu-

[10] Lower Dauphin School District, Hummelstown, Pa. 17036.

[11] The School Management Appraisal and Rating Technique (SMART) has been endorsed by the Pennsylvania School Boards Association.

ative criteria for teachers and administrators are adopted,[12] another traditional complaint against such plans, *i.e.*, unclear and unstated standards, will be invalidated. Thus:

7-4.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS SHOULD ENCOURAGE THE DEVELOPMENT OF LOCALLY NEGOTIATED MERIT PAY AND/OR MERIT BONUS PLANS FOR SCHOOL EMPLOYES.

* * *

The evaluation of professional personnel has important implications for in-service education,[13] an area which needs greater attention and emphasis than heretofore.[14] Not only should administrators play important roles in the selection, assignment, transfer and dismissal of staff, they should also play the key roles in determining the educational needs of beginning professional staff. Therefore, the Commission recommends that:

7-5.0 THE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS OR HIS DESIGNEE SHOULD GIVE GUIDANCE AND APPROVAL FOR IN-SERVICE LEARNING EXPERIENCES DURING THE FIRST FIVE YEARS OF A PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYE'S CAREER.

In-service educational experiences sometimes require the expenditure of district funds; thus, it is only appropriate for the superintendent to play a key role in this matter. More importantly, administrators, with their educational experience, the performance evaluations at their disposal, and their understanding of present and future district needs, should be in an excellent position to advise beginning teachers. It is likely that superintendents would often delegate the task of advising teachers in this matter to principals because of their proximity to the classroom. While a superintendent might wish to delegate the responsibility of advising administrators about their continuing educational needs, it is desirable that the administrator charged with this task hold a higher rank that the person being advised.

* * *

While administrators should play important parts in determining the educational needs of professional staff, it should not be forgotten that administrators have continuing educational needs themselves. It is apparent that the enactment of legislation permitting public employes to bargain collectively has put many administrators (and school boards)

---

[12] See Staffing recommendations 6-17.0 and 6-18.0.

[13] Joseph B. DeAngelis, "Survey of the Impact of the School District Reorganization Act of 1963 (Act 299) Upon Selected Elementary Schools of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania," (Educational Development Center, Edinboro State College, 1973) p. 6.

[14] See Staffing and Supportive Services chapters for additional discussion of in-service education.

in a difficult situation. Administrators with little understanding of the negotiating process have often been called on to bargain for the local board. Principals, usually excluded from the negotiating sessions, have been called on to execute contracts with little prior understanding of how their professional relationships have been changed by the collective bargaining process. Therefore:

7-6.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE THAT PRESENT AND FUTURE ADMINISTRATORS BE FAMILIAR WITH THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROCESS.

* * *

Additionally, Act 195 has made it necessary to specify which school employes should be eligible for membership in employe organizations or unions. The Commission believes that the best way to determine such eligibility is on the basis of whether or not the employe's job description requires him to perform performance evaluations of other staff. Thus:

7-7.0 PRINCIPALS, DEPARTMENT HEADS, OR ANY OTHER PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYES WHO EVALUATE THE PERFORMANCE OF INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF SHOULD BE CONSIDERED PART OF THE MANAGEMENT TEAM FOR PURPOSES OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING; THEY SHOULD PARTICIPATE IN THE COLLECTIVE BARGAINING PROCESS IN AN ADVISORY CAPACITY; AND THEY SHOULD NOT BE ELIGIBLE FOR MEMBERSHIP IN TEACHER UNIONS.

This would prevent people in a supervisory capacity from being put in a position of conflicting interests.

* * *

As previously stated, the public deserves effective and economical management at all levels of the educational system, from the classroom to the Department of Education. Perhaps the most important level in the educational hierarchy responsible for handling public funds is the school district. Serious questions have been raised regarding the qualifications of some administrators charged with handling school business affairs.[15]

In some cases, secretaries of school boards also serve as business managers, thus creating dual-control administration situations in which the district superintendent must compete with the board secretary for control of the educational system. Thus:

7-8.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD REQUIRE ALL DISTRICTS IN THE COMMONWEALTH TO HAVE A QUALIFIED BUSINESS MANAGER. BUSINESS MANAGERS SHOULD BE PROHIBITED FROM ALSO SERVING AS BOARD SECRETARIES. DISTRICT BUSINESS MANAGERS SHOULD BE ACCOUNTABLE TO DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENTS.

[15] *Ibid.*

The business manager should be accountable to the superintendent for: (1) ensuring the maximum use of school facilities and equipment by the public as well as the school-aged population; (2) supplying requested financial information to the Pennsylvania Department of Education, local school boards and the public; (3) making a minimum of one report to the public per year which describes the district's budget, expenditures and fiscal strength relative to projected needs in simple language, and ensuring the dissemination of this report to the school board, local news media and any private citizen or group requesting copies; (4) being involved in the development of district long range plans; (5) purchasing and requisitioning supplies and equipment; (6) conducting a minimum of one audit per year; (7) improving the allocation of district funds and generally ensuring the sound fiscal operation of this district's educational programs; and (8) performing any other duties which the Commonwealth or local board may delegate.

Business managers should not have to be certified by the Commonwealth nor be required to have had previous teaching experience. The Department of Education should prepare and disseminate a list of competencies and character requirements which such managers should possess.

Some school districts are not large enough to justify the employment of full-time business managers. The need for effective management is so great, however, that business responsibilities should be fixed in a definite manner, if only through the employment of a part-time qualified person.

* * *

Another problem in school management is the practice of hiring head teachers instead of principals solely for reasons of economy. While the Commission rejects this practice, it recognizes the utility of head teachers in certain educational programs and believes it is legitimate for such personnel to supervise very small buildings. Nonetheless:

7-9.0 DISTRICTS SHOULD NOT HIRE HEAD TEACHERS INSTEAD OF CERTIFIED PRINCIPALS OR ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS SIMPLY TO SAVE MONEY ON SALARIES.

Evaluations of district programs should include an examination of the quality of building management as well as the instructional leadership of the principal or person responsible for a particular school. The supervision of schools should not be left to those without the necessary skills.

* * *

The inaccessibility of administrative careers to women and members of racial and ethnic minorities has attracted much attention in recent years. Members of such groups have not been encouraged to pursue

careers in school administration. Those who have entered the profession have often been discriminated against in such areas as promotion and salary. That there are very few women principals and even fewer superintendents[16] in Pennsylvania typifies the fact that, as occupations increase in salary, prestige and power, they tend to become white male-dominated. Also, although hard data are lacking, it is apparent that the percentage of black school administrators and other professionals in Pennsylvania is very small. Students who do not have the opportunity to meet and learn to deal with members of other racial and cultural groups can hardly be considered fully educated. Also, increasing the number of minority group and women administrators would provide positive leadership models for the children of such groups to emulate. The large number of women in the teaching profession provides a plentiful source from which to recruit future management personnel. Also, the breakup of the dual school system in the South has provided a supply of qualified black administrators who are seeking employment elsewhere.[17]

7-10.0 SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHOULD WORK TO IMPROVE STAFF BALANCES BY HIRING QUALIFIED MEMBERS OF DIFFERENT RACIAL, AGE, SEX, AND ETHNIC GROUPS.

Physical Facilities

Recognizing the problems associated with the increased use of school facilities and properties by community members—extra maintenance costs, possible scheduling conflicts, possible increased vandalism or breakage—the Commission nonetheless believes that the benefits of increased public involvement in schol life far outweigh such problems as those listed above. Increasing community use of school facilities[18] gives a greater human return on the large capital investment made by the citizens of the local area. Of the school systems responding to the Department of Education survey, 94 per cent listed better public relations as a result of attempting to involve the community more directly in school life. Many superintendents found that the public is more receptive to increased educational costs when local residents use the schools. Many schools could become virtual community centers if state funds were made available to offset costs for maintenance and breakage. Therefore:

[16] When this report was issued, there were no women superintendents in Pennsylvania.
[17] The National Education Association has recently completed a search for qualified black professional educators displaced—often unfairly—by the desegregation of Southern school systems. Lists of available teachers and administrators may be obtained by contacting the National Education Association, Program for Displaced Educators and Students, 1201 16th Street, NW, Washington, D. C. 20036.
[18] See also chapters on Supportive Services and Organization for Instruction.

7-11.0 SCHOOL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT SHOULD BE USED AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE BY MEMBERS OF THE SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY. SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHOULD COOPERATE WITH OTHER AGENCIES TO PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROPERLY SUPERVISED COMMUNITY LEARNING AND RECREATION ON A YEAR-ROUND BASIS. SCHOOLS SHOULD BE USED AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE AT NIGHT, ON WEEK-ENDS AND DURING VACATIONS. STATE FUNDS SHOULD BE MADE AVAILABLE TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN ORDER TO MAKE COMMUNITY-ORIENTED RECREATION AND LEARNING PROGRAMS AVAILABLE.

* * *

There has been a recurring proposal for the creation of standard architectural plans for Commonwealth schools. The Lawrence commission (1961)[19] opposed such plans largely on the basis of feasibility and cost. The cost of altering standard plans to fit local conditions might be prohibitive in some cases. A variety of architectural styles has aesthetic value, too. Finally, standard plans contribute to uniform educational programs by limiting the possible instructional methods and curricular offerings. Schools should be built to fit the needs of instructional programs, not vice versa. However:

7-12.0 THE COMMONWEALTH SHOULD BECOME THE OWNER OF ALL ARCHITECTURAL PLANS FOR SCHOOL BUILDINGS WHICH IT SUBSIDIZES. THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD POOL THESE PLANS AND MAKE THEM AVAILABLE TO ANY DISTRICT CONSIDERING THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW BUILDING.

If a district uses architectural plans from the Commonwealth's collection as the basis for a new building, that district should be required to pay the original architect a fee. This fee, however, should be substantially smaller than the fee originally paid to the architect for these plans.

* * *

Urban school districts face monumental difficulties with respect to construction costs for school buildings. Charges for labor, land and building materials are usually much higher in urban centers than in suburban or rural locales. Therefore:

7-13.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD ENCOURAGE DISTRICTS TO LEASE AND RENOVATE (IF NECESSARY) FACILITIES, INSTEAD OF UNDERTAKING NEW BUILDING PROJECTS WHERE LEASING BEST MEETS LOCAL NEEDS OR WHERE THE NEED FOR ADDITIONAL SPACE IS SEEN AS TEMPORARY.

As more districts adopt year-round school plans,[20] climate control systems will become necessary to ensure an adequate learning environment. Even school districts which retain the traditional calendar would

[19] See The Final Report of the Committee on Education, appointed by Governor David L. Lawrence, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, April 1961.
[20] See Organization for Instruction chapter, recommendation 5-4.0.

benefit from the installation of such systems. The Commonwealth should develop funding strategies to aid districts in this costly process. Thus:

7-14.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE THAT CLIMATE CONTROL SYSTEMS BE INSTALLED IN ALL NEW SCHOOL BUILDINGS.

Further:

7-15.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE THAT ALL EXISTING BUILDINGS BE BROUGHT UP TO SUITABLE MAINTENANCE STANDARDS AND, WHEN FEASIBLE, BE MODERNIZED BY THE INSTALLATION OF CLIMATE CONTROL SYSTEMS.

* * *

Another question regarding physical facilities and properties is that of insurance. In the 1972-73 school year, school districts paid almost $8 million to commercial insurance companies for fire protection.[21] Insurance rates in this area have risen sharply as a result of the unrest of the late sixties. Some companies which previously were eager to offer policies to districts have become reluctant to do business with school districts at all. The efforts of private organizations have helped reduce rates in some areas, but substantial problems remain. School properties are so widely dispersed as to make it reasonable for the Commonwealth to perform the function of an insurance company, thereby eliminating the cost of commissions, company profits and the burdensome job of updating property appraisals annually. The Commonwealth might underwrite the losses suffered by districts completely or protect itself against catastrophic rises through a low cost deductible policy.

7-16.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER, SHOULD UNDERTAKE A FEASIBILITY STUDY TO CONSIDER THE POSSIBLE MERITS OF A STATE SELF-INSURANCE PROGRAM COVERING FIRE AND EXTENDED COVERAGE BENEFITS FOR SCHOOL BUILDINGS, PROPERTIES AND SUPPLIES.

Several states have such programs in operation at present.[22] While facts are not available to determine how much of the approximate $8 million paid to commercial companies was returned last year as benefits, it is estimated that substantial savings could result from a state self-insurance plan.

A recent court decision has stated that school districts may be held liable for injury incurred on school property.[23] Most districts have

[21] Pennsylvania Department of Education, Division of Educational Statistics.

[22] Delaware is the most recent state to undertake a study of a state self-insurance program for school districts.

[23] *Ayala vs Philadelphia Board of Public Education.* Opinion filed: May 23, 1973.

properly responded to this changed situation by securing liability coverage. However, some districts have failed to do this.

7-17.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE ALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO HAVE ADEQUATE LIABILITY INSURANCE COVERAGE WITHIN THE NEXT YEAR. THE STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER SHOULD ESTABLISH MINIMUM COVERAGE GUIDELINES FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

Planning, Operations and Evaluation

Constructive change requires effective comprehensive planning, an area where the Commission has found substantial room for improvement on all levels. School boards and administrators tend not to involve broadly representative groups of people in planning procedures, relying almost exclusively on paid consultants. In some long range plans submitted to the Pennsylvaina Department of Education, insufficient thought seems to have been given to the relationship between curricular needs and facility design. Some intermediate units do not presently appear to be capable of rendering effective help in needs assessment programs and long range planning to the districts they serve. Finally, the Commonwealth has given only small planning grants to intermediate units and has helped only those few units which have initiated requests for Department of Education assistance. The Department of Education, the intermediate units[24] and the districts must coordinate and mutually support efforts to improve planning and evaluation practices.

Systematic planning requires:

a. a problem or evidence that change is necessary
b. a large data base from which to draw a clear understanding of the problem and its probable causes
c. philosophical direction, specific and realistic objectives and a means of evaluating the instructional programs which seek to realize these objectives and goals
d. the participation of representatives of the relevant elements within the school, community, district, intermediate unit or the Department of Education
e. the development of implementation procedures for the new programs designed to remedy the problem defined
f. evaluation processes which review both the instructional process and product and which solicit the impressions of all elements of the school community as well as making use of formal testing devices

[24] For additional discussion of intermediate units, see the chapter on Supportive Services.

g. reporting procedures which inform all of the parties involved and which ensure public awareness of the type and quality of education being offered their children.

In short, educational improvement should result more often when planning and evaluation is systematic and inclusive of the school's various constituencies. With this planning model in mind, the following recommendations are made:

7-18.0 THE STATEWIDE, COMPUTERIZED, EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION SYSTEM PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.[25]

This system should link the Department of Education with state-owned and stated-related colleges and universities, cooperating private institutions, intermediate units and school districts.

7-19.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE EACH SCHOOL DISTRICT TO ALLOCATE A MINIMUM OF ONE HALF OF ONE PER CENT OF ITS BUDGET TO FUND THE DETERMINATION OF CURRICULUM PRIORITIES, PLANNING AND EVALUATIONS. THE SCHOOL DISTRICT'S BUDGET SHOULD REFLECT THESE CURRICULUM PRIORITIES.

Without a mandate for the provision of funds for this purpose, very little is likely to happen. Many educators recommend a figure of up to five per cent. The Commission's recommendation, then, is only a beginning.

7-20.0 SCHOOL DISTRICT LONG RANGE PLANS SHOULD FOCUS ON CURRICULUM NEEDS AND INSTRUCTIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERNS, BUT SHOULD ALSO INCLUDE FACILITY AND PROGRAM NEEDS TOGETHER WITH PROPOSED CHANGES OVER A PERIOD OF NOT LESS THAN FIVE YEARS. THESE PLANS SHOULD BE REVISED ANNUALLY AND SHOULD PROVIDE FOR REVIEW OF CURRICULUM, EVALUATION OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS AND PLANNING FOR CHANGE.

7-20.1 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO PUBLISH AND SUBMIT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FIVE-YEAR BUDGET PROJECTIONS (TO BE UPDATED ANNUALLY) WHICH ARE COMPATIBLE WITH DISTRICT LONG RANGE PLANS. PUBLIC HEARINGS SHOULD BE HELD REGARDING THESE FIVE-YEAR PROJECTIONS PRIOR TO SUBMISSION TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

7-21.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD DEVELOP PERSONNEL TEAMS CHARGED SPECIFICALLY WITH AIDING DISTRICTS IN PROBLEM AREAS, *E.G.*, PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, AND GRANT APPLICATIONS.

---

[25] The initial study which resulted in development of the Pennsylvania Educational Computer System (PECS) was begun in February of 1971.

In the Governance chapter of this report, it is recommended that the State Board of Education should evaluate every school district periodically. It is further recommended that:

7-22.0 THIS EVALUATION SHOULD EXAMINE BOTH THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS (MEANS OF INSTRUCTION) AND THE EDUCATIONAL PRODUCT (ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS).

Part of this evaluation process should be participation in the Educational Quality Assessment program:[26]

7-23.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE ALL DISTRICTS TO PARTICIPATE ON A CONTINUING BASIS IN EDUCATIONAL QUALITY ASSESSMENT PROGRAMS WITHIN THE NEXT THREE YEARS.

School districts should not only cooperate with the Department's evaluating teams, but should help gather information to be used in the evaluation. Thus:

7-24.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE EACH DISTRICT TO DEVELOP AND UPDATE REGULARLY A SYSTEMATIC PROCEDURE FOR COLLECTING DATA TO ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH STATE AND LOCAL LEARNING OUTCOMES ARE BEING ACHIEVED.

Districts are encouraged to evaluate their efforts on an annual basis, if posible. However, the above recommendation could also aid the Department in making its periodic evaluations.

The results of all evaluation processes should be made available to the public in easily understood English or in other languages when necessary. These results should be made available to the school board, advisory groups, members of the schools themselves and to local media.

Districts should be required to use the evaluation data in operating in-service programs and in developing long range plans.

The Department of Education should use the concepts of flexible and personalized learning as the key criteria for evaluations. The proposed State Board of Education instructional process criteria[27] should not be considered minimum standards but as a counterpart to the Ten Goals of Quality Education. These criteria should be used to encourage districts to excel and should not be used as a basis for penalizing districts.

[26] Quality assessment in Pennsylvania had its origin in Section 290.1 of Act 299, August 8, 1963, which required that the State Board of Education "develop or cause to be developed an evaluation procedure designed to measure objectively the adequacy and efficiency of the educational programs offered by the public schools of the Commonwealth. The evaluation procedure to be developed shall include tests measuring the achievements and performance of students pursuing all of the various subjects and courses comprising the curricula."

[27] See Organization for Instruction chapter, recommendation 5-1.0.

Organizational Relationships and Structures

The way in which the institutions and organizations constituting the educational system in Pennsylvania are structured and interact has important implications for the education of students. This idea was implicit in the school district reorganization process of the 1960's, in which over 2,000 districts in Pennsylvania were reorganized into the present 505 districts.

The Commission is concerned that the present ways in which large urban school districts are organized may not enhance the learning opportunities of students. Current organizational patterns may also encourage racial segregation. The Commission has also received testimony that the administrative units within the Philadelphia School District may be too large, both in terms of geographic area and the number of students served, to promote effective management and accountability. Thus:

7-25.0 THE GOVERNOR SHOULD CREATE A COMMISSION TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION OF THE PITTSBURGH AND PHILADELPHIA SCHOOL DISTRICTS. THE COMMISSION SHOULD PAY SPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE POSSIBLE IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL UNITS, RELATIONSHIPS AND FUNCTIONS ON THE GENERAL QUALITY OF EDUCATION AND ON THE RELATED QUESTION OF EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY.

Conclusion

Schools will not measurably improve unless all levels of administration work together in managing all facets of the educational system. All levels of administration must coordinate their efforts to give their districts consistent leadership.

While administrators will probably become more influential in policy making due to the increasing complexity of school life, administrators must make sincere attempts to make all professional employes feel that they have a bigger stake in their school and district than merely gaining and keeping a job.

Organizational discipline has often been regarded as something externally imposed and enforced by the higher echelons of administration. While administrators must retain legal authority over educational programs, wise administrators know that formal control is used very sparingly in healthy professional relationships. Dictatorial or unilateral administrative action can produce dependence, resentment or even rebellion on the part of teachers and students. Defensiveness inhibits imagination, creativity and the willingness to try something different—indecisiveness and passivity are often unconscious strategies for accommodating powerful "superiors." High control administration orients

the student, teacher and staff members more toward appeasing authorities than toward enhancing the learning process. Rigid roles and controls often result in negative self-concepts, which are incompatible with Pennsylvania's Ten Goals of Quality Education. It is unreasonable to expect that children will learn to value themselves from teachers who are fearful, anxious or who play no role in establishing educational goals or policies.[28]

Administrators should act as catalysts, team-builders and cooperative problem-solvers as much as possible rather than as authors of administrative commands. Leadership approaches which accept responsible participation in forming certain school policies and programs by teachers and students should be encouraged. Administrators must encourage creative thought and constructive criticism: the best discipline comes with high morale.

Involving members of the school's various internal and external constituencies in policy-making and encouraging and implementing new ideas and programs requires a strong, yet highly adaptive and diplomatic character on the part of administrators. Decision-making patterns which place a premium on communication and cooperation can successfully be integrated with formal authority structures. However demanding these views may be, the Commission feels that they are a pragmatic response to increased pressures for participation in policy-making by employe organizations, a fairer approach to problem-solving, an encouragement of intelligent thought and positive self-concepts on the part of staff, and an aid to people to learn how to make decisions in the most direct manner—by placing them in the arena of choice.

---

[28] See Jack Gibb, "Expanding Role of the Adiminstrator" *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin*, 51 (May, 1967) 46-60.

Chapter VIII

Governance

Introduction

In education, governance is the political function of making educational policy as distinguished from the administering of educational policy decisions.[1] This Commission believes that the governance processes in our educational system should be carefully examined. How educational policies are made, who makes them, and what group or agency is charged with administrative policy are issues of fundamental significance.

The educational system in the Commonwealth must, above all else, be a just system. It must be based upon and operated within the provisions of the United States Constitution, the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the laws and regulations adopted by the General Assembly and the State Board of Education.

Since law is dynamic and not static, it is necessary to reexamine periodically how well the law functions in ensuring equity and due process in the operation of society. How equitable the law is, and how well the law functions in the governance of the schools of the Commonwealth, is the concern of this chapter.

Governance affects all other aspects of the educational system. Governance processes affect decisions about what should be taught, who should teach it, where it should be taught, or how it should be financed.

This Commission is committed to the idea of operating a basic educational system which offers equality of educational opportunity, flexible and personalized learning and the maximum involvement of all groups in the conduct of the educational process. Governance procedures in the educational system should be compatible with these objectives. In addition, the governance system should have embodied in it those elements of accountability which will help ensure that the kind of education advocated by this Commission will, in fact, occur.

Not only should the governance system be compatible with the basic ideals of this report, but the teaching-learning process in our schools should also promote the governance ideals expressed in this chapter. We cannot teach about good government in our curriculum if we do

[1] Matters pertaining to the administration of educational policy are discussed primarily in the Management chapter of this report.

not try to govern our schools well. Nor can good government flourish without its underlying ideals being taught well in the classrooms of our schools.

In this chapter, the Commission examines the formal governance agencies of the educational system: the General Assembly, the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, Boards of School Directors, and Boards of Education.[2] Consideration is also given to the relationship of administration, teachers, parents, students and interested citizens to these formal agencies.

The Commission believes the recommendations in this chapter will help achieve and maintain a delicate balance of power between the needs of the Commonwealth and the needs of local communities. Views will vary on what should be the precise nature of this balance, but the need to examine both state and local responsibilities in the governance process is the underlying premise for these recommendations.

How the Educational Governance System Works and Related Problems

It is not possible to discuss ways to improve the governance system in education without briefly commenting on how the system works. Most citizens are familiar only with that part of the educational governance system which functions at the district level, *i.e.*, the school board. There are other very important agencies in this system which require comment.

Article 3, Section 15 of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania states:

> The General Assembly shall provide for the maintenance and support of a thorough and efficient system of public education to serve the needs of the Commonwealth.

It is the General Assembly which is charged with the basic responsibility for providing an adequate educational system throughout the Commonwealth. No other agency of government has the extent and degree of power over education possessed by the General Assembly. The power possessed by all other educational agencies is power delegated to them by the General Assembly. What it grants, it can take away. Only a change in the Constitution could alter or weaken the power of the General Assembly over education.

The General Assembly carries out its function in providing an adequate education by enacting laws for the governance of the system and by appropriating funds for the state's share of the costs of education.

[2] Pittsburgh and Philadelphia have appointed Boards of Education. All other districts have Boards of School Directors. See pp. 95-96 and 99-101 for further discussion of these agencies.

The laws which the General Assembly enacts to operate the educational system are included in the *Public School Code of 1949, as amended.*[3] Reference must be made to these laws when discussing ways to improve education in the Commonwealth.

The State Board of Education was created in 1963 by the General Assembly. It replaced a weaker State Council. It consists of 17 members appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the state Senate. Its function is to adopt policies, set standards, establish rules and regulations and affirm principles which relate to the governance of the education in the Commonwealth. It is the state counterpart of the school board in the local community. But there is one very important difference. The State Board of Education has no taxing power. As an arm of the legislature it has, however, other quasi-legislative and judicial authority delegated to it. And the regulations passed by the State Board have the same legal effect as laws enacted by the General Assembly.

The Pennsylvania Department of Education[4] was established by the General Assembly in the Administrative Code of 1929. Its chief executive officer is the Secretary of Education who is appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. He is also chief executive of the State Board. The Department administers the laws of the legislature and the regulations of the State Board. It also assists school districts in conducting educational programs by providing professional advice. The Department's present organization and status in the educational system are the result of years of evolution. The Department's origin dates back to the passage of the Free School Act of 1834.

Originally the Department dealt solely with matters pertaining to public schools. Today, it has wide-ranging educational responsibility which includes nonpublic school affairs as well as general educational concerns. As the state's administrative agency for education, the Department is responsible for protecting the Commonwealth's interest in education.

The Department plays an important leadership role as advocate for improved educational practices, as well as enforcing existing educational laws and regulations.

The most familiar agencies which have significant governance powers in the educational system are the Boards of School Directors and

---

[3] *The Public School Code of 1949, as amended* may be purchased from the Bureau of Information and Publications, Pa. Department of Education, Box 911, Harrisburg, Pa. 17126. The cost is $3.18 (tax included). Make checks payable to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

[4] Formerly the Department of Public Instruction.

Boards of Education.[5] The boards are creatures of the General Assembly established to operate schools across the Commonwealth. Taking their authority from the School Code these boards exercise broad power and responsibility. They must, however, conduct their business according to the laws enacted by the General Assembly, the regulations of the State Board, and the guidelines of the Department of Education. They are not free to act as sovereign entities. Nevertheless, within their legal jurisdiction are the critical functions of setting policy for the governance of schools.

Board of School Directors, unlike Boards of Education in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, possess the direct power and responsibility for raising the necessary funds for the support of education at the local level.[6]

To operate the thorough and efficient educational system required by the Pennsylvania Constitution, these four elements of the formal governance system must work cooperatively. While each level of the system holds some powers exclusively, most governance powers are shared. This sharing produces a constant interfacing of the various governing agencies which, in turn, inevitably creates tension in the governance of education. The nature of this interrelationship and the effects of this tension were examined closely by the Commission. As a result of this examination, the Commission believes that there are four basic ways to improve the operation of the governance process in education in the Commonwealth:

a. by providing more effective state leadership in education

b. by establishing greater accountability in the state and local governance of education

c. by improving school board operations

d. by increasing community involvement in the governmental process

Justification for these statements and a description of the proposed corrective action which should be taken constitute the remainder of this chapter.

Providing More Effective State Leadership in Education

The distribution of the responsibilities for governance of education is not neatly divided. There will always be enough overlap of gov-

---

[5] See footnote 2 of this chapter on page 2.

[6] The Boards of Education in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia have the responsibility to provide adequate funding for their educational programs but not the legal power to levy taxes.

ernance responsibilities among agencies to raise questions regarding the proper placement of primary responsibility for a specific function. In the past, there has not always been a high degree of cooperation between the General Assembly, the State Board of Education and the Department of Education. This has caused problems for the educational system and has retarded the advancement of education in the Commonwealth. Therefore:

8-1.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION SHOULD COOPERATE IN CLOSE LIAISON IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF STATUTORY CHANGES, NEW REGULATIONS AND REVISED STANDARDS IN THE OPERATION OF THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM.

While the General Assembly is constitutionally the most powerful element of the three at the state level, it is important the State Board of Education and the Department of Education also exert strong leadership in education. The legislative objectives of the General Assembly will be fulfilled only if the necessary implementation regulations and administrative policies are established and enforced by the State Board and the Department of Education. Similarly, these two groups need the support of the General Assembly for adequate funding and for the broad legislative mandates necessary to operate an effective and efficient system. A spirit of genuine cooperation among these groups is essential.

* * *

The cooperation recommended here requires that the General Assembly have the information needed to carry out its vital role. In particular, it is the responsibility of the Department of Education to assist the General Assembly by keeping it informed of the general needs of the schools in the Commonwealth. An active leadership role by the Department and the State Board will help facilitate the timely enactment of legislation which is in the interests of the system. The role of legislator is, after all, a difficult one. Legislators must write laws in all areas of governmental operation. Leadership provided by the Department and the State Board should keep the members of the legislature informed and better able to carry out their responsibilities in the area of education. Therefore:

8-2.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD TAKE A MORE ACTIVE ROLE IN KEEPING THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AWARE OF THE NEEDS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM OF THE COMMONWEALTH.

There are many ways to accomplish this. The most obvious is for the Department to act decisively in proposing or reacting to proposed

legislation whenever the situation warrants. Also, it should provide a regular means of communication to the General Assembly to inform its members of promising programs or unattended needs. In addition, Department officials should become more familiar with the legislative process to enable them to comprehend more fully the kinds of pressures and problems which legislators face in carrying out their difficult responsibilities.

Establishing Greater Accountability in the State and Local Government of Education

No system of governance in a free society will succeed if it is not accountable to its constituents. To be accountable is to identify not only the objects for which the public resources have been devoted, but also the manner and effect of their application. Educational accountability is essential if each level of governance is to do its part to meet the needs and interests of students.

As mentioned earlier, the legal charter for the conduct of education in Pennsylvania is the *Public School Code of 1949, as amended.* No system of educational accountability will ever work unless the Commonwealth has a clearly written, well defined, up-to-date School Code. Unfortunately, that does not exist now. The present Code, last revised in 1949, has many outdated, ambiguous and no longer needed provisions. It is, in some regards, a 19th Century document setting the directions for an educational system whose present students will live the majority of their adult lives in the 21st Century.[7] Therefore:

8-3.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD RECODIFY THE *PUBLIC SCHOOL CODE OF 1949.*[8] FURTHER, THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD REVIEW AND UPDATE THE CODE EVERY TEN YEARS.

The revised Code should carefully define the legal responsibilities and functions that the various agencies of the system are to perform. These revised provisions should be sufficiently unambiguous to provide for a truly functional accountability system. The system cannot be made more accountable if the division of responsibility remains a source of conflict and dispute.

---

[7] Section 740 of the Code reads as follows: ". . . the board of school directors shall keep all water closets or outhouses . . . in a clean and sanitary condition, and shall, not less than ten (10) days prior to the opening of any term of school and oftener if necessary have them properly cleaned and disinfected by the use of fresh dry-slacked lime, or other proper disinfecting materials."

[8] The Department initiated efforts to recodify the Code in October, 1973.

Throughout this report suggestions for changes in the School Code will be offered. All such suggested changes should take into consideration the diverse characteristics of the various communities and regions in the Commonwealth. Allowance should be made in the revised Code, as is the case presently,[9] for a classification of school districts according to their size. Some regulations should affect all school districts regardless of size. Other regulations should pertain only to districts of a certain class. The concept of legislating by class of district should be retained.

* * *

The Commission believes that the principle of educational accountability applies also to the Department of Education. Since it has the responsibility on the state level for administering the educational system, it is necessary that the Department keep the public informed of its policies and programs. It should also foster public participation in carrying out its responsibilities.

What the Commission expects of school districts, it expects also of the Department of Education. Therefore:

8-4.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD PREPARE AND DISTRIBUTE STATEWIDE ANNUALLY A GENERAL PLAN STATING ITS UPDATED GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES.

The existence of such a plan will help the general public and the various educational interest groups know what the Department is trying to do. Given this knowledge, it will then be easier for the general public to evaluate how well the Department is carrying out its responsibilities.

* * *

A basic element of accountability in the existing governance system is provision for voters to elect school board members. As is the custom in American society, the local electorate has the opportunity to evaluate the performance of the school board by exercising the right to vote. If the school board through its representatives, the superintendent and his associates, does not perform in a satisfactory manner, school board members can be voted out of office.

Residents of Pittsburgh and Philadelphia do not have the opportunity to vote for members of the boards of education in those cities. In these two very large districts, the General Assembly has established

[9] Section 202 of the present Code establishes five (5) classes of districts: 1st Class (1,500,000 population); 1st Class A (500,000 to 1,500,000); 2nd Class (30,000 to 500,000); 3rd Class (5,000 to 30,000); and 4th Class (Less than 5,000). The Commission endorses the concept of establishing classes of districts but does not endorse these particular standards. It did not study this matter.

Boards of Education which have only appointed members. As a consequence, unlike all other school districts, Pittsburgh and Philadelphia Boards of Education do not have the right to levy taxes. In these two cities, the taxing power for education resides not in the boards but in the respective city councils and the General Assembly.

Originally, in Pennsylvania, all school boards were elected. In time, evidence developed that the political machines in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia were controlling the school board election process. Corruption of serious proportion developed. Hoping to protect the residents of these two districts, the General Assembly abolished elected boards in these cities and substituted a system of court-appointed boards. In Philadelphia, with the Educational Home Rule Charter (1965), the appointing power was transferred from the Board of Common Pleas Judges to the Mayor and an Educational Nominating Panel.

While opinions differ greatly on how well the appointed boards have served their districts, it is hard to argue that such appointed boards provide for a greater degree of educational accountability than elected boards would. If one disapproves of the behavior of an appointed board it is difficult to exercise influence to change the membership on it. It appears, therefore, that Pennsylvania should join the mainstream in the nation[10] and do away with the present dual system of having both appointed and elective school boards. Therefore, the Commission recommends that:

8-5.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD ENACT LEGISLATION REQUIRING ALL SCHOOL BOARDS IN THE COMMONWEALTH TO BE ELECTED.

Giving Philadelphia and Pittsburgh elective school boards will not automatically improve the degree of educational accountability in these districts. But it will alleviate current apathetic feelings which exist among citizens born of the view that "There is little I can do about it" when school directors are appointed not elected. Granting school districts in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia elected boards will lay the constitutional basis for them to levy taxes. Once possessed of the power to levy taxes, they would no longer be able to escape direct responsibility for adequate local financing of schools.

* * *

There is another serious problem associated with the election of school board members in Pennsylvania. The current law permits school districts, on an optional basis, to elect school board members on either

[10] A survey initiated by the Commission shows that of the fifty (50) states and seven (7) trust territories surveyed, only four (4) states have totally appointed boards, with thirteen (13) having both appointed and elected, the higher percentage of those mixed systems being elected.

an at-large basis or by district representation. Many of the school boards in Pennsylvania today operate only with members elected at-large. Where this is so, it is possible for the most populous part of a school district to dominate disproportionately the membership on the school board. Since school districts have been reorganized, making larger districts out of several smaller ones, it is not uncommon to find entire communities without a seat on the regional school board. This occurs because the smaller communities are part of a combined system which links them with larger centers of population. A result is the disenfranchisement of the smaller communities. Sometimes, this lack of representation has racial or social class overtones. Because this Commission believes that underrepresentation or lack of representation in the governance process is undesirable, it recommends that:

8-6.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD AMEND THE SCHOOL CODE TO REQUIRE SCHOOL BOARDS TO BE ELECTED ON BOTH AN AT-LARGE AND GEOGRAPHIC REPRESENTATION BASIS.

The Commission has no specific plan to suggest to implement this change. There is, however, a clear advantage to electing some members of the school board on an at-large basis. A board composed entirely of members elected on a geographic basis can lead to narrowness and parochialism. It also eliminates the possibility of electing highly qualified candidates regardless of where they live. Thus, the Commission's proposal seeks to blend the best of both systems in one.

* * *

There is no more basic element of an accountability system than that which ensures the constitutional rights of all citizens. Presently, there is an inadequate provision for the protection of students' constitutional rights since these rights are nowhere clearly enunciated. In many cases, such rights have been abrogated by school districts with little or no corrective action by the State Board or the Department of Education.

There is a great need to affirm these constitutional rights and to develop guidelines for their protection. Whether by ignorance or design, school districts should not be permitted to usurp students' rights. Correspondingly, the question of what constitutes the responsibilities of students is ambiguous and subject to much dispute. Just as there are examples of students' rights being violated, there have been recent instances of student actions which have jeopardized the rights of others within the system or which have resulted in damage to public property. The issues of rights and responsibilities are inseparable, and they need to be linked in any attempt to deal with the question of the proper relation between students and school districts.

Where there is not state standard establishing students' rights and responsibilities, it is necessary for students with a grievance to take the school district to court to obtain justice. This creates financial and edutional hardships to the student, his family, and the district, and often results in inconsistency in the resolution of such disputes. A clear statement of such rights and responsibilities would eliminate most of the court action which now occurs in this area. Therefore:

8-7.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD ADOPT A STATEWIDE STUDENT BILL OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES WITH PROVISION FOR IMPLEMENTATION BY LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS.

This statement should cite the inviolable rights which students possess by virtue of constitutional protections and the responsibilities incumbent upon students in order to secure a general system of free public education.

A student's constitutional rights should not be impaired by an accident of geography. To avoid this, a state bill is needed. What methods are used for making the bill operational could vary from community to community. For instance, all districts should be required to have a grievance procedure for students, but the type of grievance procedure could vary depending upon local preferences.

The State Board should not abdicate its responsibility to assure that students are protected from arbitrary and capricious exercise of the large power delegated to school boards throughout the state.

* * *

The General Assembly has delegated to the State Board of Education the very important responsibility to determine the procedures for the certification of teachers and administrators, that is, to determine who shall enter the profession, and who shall be authorized to exercise leadership in it. In turn, school boards have the responsibility to carry out the required regular evaluation of teachers and administrators.

The State Board presently sets standards for teacher and administrator certification programs through a method known as the program approval process. Institutions of higher education desirous of training future teachers or administrators must develop training programs and submit them in writing to the Department for approval. The Department then sponsors a visit by a team of educators to the institution to evaluate the program. Those programs deemed effective and viable are then approved for operation entitling the institution to offer certificates in the name of the Commonwealth. This system replaces the long established practice of the State Board specifying a uniform number and type of college courses required for certification. This older system

proved to be both arbitrary and restrictive. It should not be revived. Therefore, the Commission recommends that:

8-8.0 THE STATE BOARD SHOULD CONTINUE TO AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TO OPERATE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS ON A PROGRAM APPROVAL BASIS AND CONTINUE TO AWARD TEACHING CERTIFICATES ON A PROGRAM APPROVAL BASIS.

The philosophy underlying the program approval concept is sound. It incorporates the kind of flexibility which this Commission believes the system should encourage.

However, there are some serious administrative problems associated with the operation of the program approval system. There is a lack of staff in the Department of Education to meet the work load created by this approach. This results in less frequent college visits than are desirable. Therefore:

8-9.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD HIRE ADEQUATE STAFF TO EVALUATE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS ON A FREQUENT AND REGULAR BASIS.

The current practice of the Department to rely primarily upon peers in the field to conduct these evaluations should continue. But, more Department staff are needed to improve the coordination and implementation of the existing program. In addition, more work is needed in evaluating the relative merits of differing approaches to teacher and administrator preparation programs. Such evaluations are necessary if the element of flexibility in this program approval process is not to be used as a dodge to avoid rigorous standards for the preparation of professional educators.

* * *

Central to any system of accountability in education is the concept of monitoring the amount and kind of learning which is occurring in the classrooms in the schools of the Commonwealth. This Commission believes that this is desirable if the State Board and local boards are to enforce a meaningful set of minimum standards for the school system. Prescribing a series of required courses, as at present, is insufficient. Such standards are measures of what students are offered for study and not what it is they have learned. The State Board does not now require monitoring of student achievement.

If effective methods of educational accountability are to be achieved the state must evaluate adequately the student learning which results from the instructional programs in the schools of the Commonwealth. Therefore:

8-10.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD MANDATE THAT EVERY SCHOOL DISTRICT IN THE COMMONWEALTH PARTICIPATE IN A PERIODIC EVALUATION CONDUCTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION. THIS EVALUATION SHOULD EXAMINE BOTH THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS (MEANS OF INSTRUCTION) AND THE EDUCATIONAL PRODUCT (ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS).

This requirement would have two purposes: to evaluate what students learn[11] and to evaluate how teachers teach.[12]

Product evaluation is measuring student learning outcomes (what students learn). If districts are to be required to maintain a reasonable degree of equal educational opportunity, it is necessary to measure the amount of learning which is occurring in the district schools to uphold minimum standards.

Each district should also undergo a regular process evaluation. This process evaluation could be accomplished at the same time as the product evaluation. The process evaluation should be designed to measure the amount of personalized and flexible education which occurs in a district. Instructional practices in schools should be measured against the process criteria established by the State Board. However, there should be no penalty attached to a district for failure to adhere to this list of process criteria. Districts should be encouraged to use *some* set of ideal instructional practices which would help them "reach for the stars".

The product and process evaluations which should be required should be conducted under regulations established by the State Board of Education and administered by the Department of Education. It is not necessary that the Department of Education staff personally conduct all these evaluations. They may be conducted by independent, outside agencies so long as the intent of the regulation is carried out. The Department of Education should, however, maintain a careful quality control over the conduct of those evaluations and, where deemed necessary, should carry out the evaluation itself, if it finds that a poor evaluation was done in a particular instance.

The Department of Education should require that districts make the results of the required evaluations public, in terms that are easily understood by all citizens. Moreover, districts should be required to use these evaluations in the operation of district in-service programs and in the development of district long range plans.

Citizens have the right to know how well the district is educating the children and youth within its jurisdiction. This would be a major

---

[11] See also the Curriculum chapter.

[12] See also the Organization for Instruction chapter.

step toward advancing the cause of educational accountability in the Commonwealth.

Such monitoring by the Department of Education on behalf of the State Board would help assure that the constitutional mandate to the General Assembly "to provide a thorough and efficient system" of education is being carried out.

In a state as large as Pennsylvania the situation periodically occurs that a school district, either through no fault of its own or through indifference, jeopardizes the basic welfare of the students in its jurisdiction. While this Commission believes in maintaining the viability of individual school districts, it is necessary to face the possibility of gross neglect of the needs of young people in a given district.

The School Code currently is silent on what the Department of Education should do where a district fails to offer a minimum educational program for all of its students. It can now withhold subsidies for failure to comply with the law (a further setback to the welfare of the students), but for blatant educational neglect of children there appears to be no remedy in the Code. Therefore:

8-11.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD ENACT LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR EDUCATIONAL RECEIVERSHIP. THIS PROCEDURE WOULD ALLOW THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TO SUPERVISE THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM IN A SCHOOL DISTRICT WHICH IGNORES STATE LAW OR STATE BOARD REGULATIONS OR WHICH, BY POOR CONTINUED PERFORMANCE, DOES NOT ACHIEVE THE LEARNING OUTCOMES AS PRESCRIBED BY THE STATE AND LOCAL PLAN.

If a district consistently refuses to meet state minimum standards as they relate to student achievement, the Department should have the power to place a district into "receivership" much as it now does with financially distressed school districts. Such action should occur only as a last resort and under adequate provision of due process. The receivership program should have as its goal the earliest possible return of full authority to the district in receivership. While in receivership, the Department should assist the district to correct the deficiencies cited.

* * *

One means that the Department of Education currently uses to increase the degree of accountability in the operation of the educational system is to require school districts to submit to the Department long range operational plans for approval. These plans must now include the following:

a. plans for community involvement
b. district's program goals

c. plans to achieve racial balance
d. facility needs
e. community trends and population profiles
f. listing of special project monies
g. organization standards
h. miscellaneous, as defined by the Secretary of Education

The theory of having the Department require long range plans from districts is good. Districts are not permitted to construct new buildings or remodel old ones unless they have an approved plan. In practice, however, this program lacks "teeth".

Plans which are submitted to the Department often involve considerable expense in their preparation and yet they appear to gather dust on the shelves of the Department. Only in cases of unusual controversy or court litigation does the long range plan become a major issue in the operation of a school district. There is little reason for the district to pay much attention to its existing plan because the Department does little, if any, monitoring of school district attempts to comply with its submitted plan. Therefore:

8-12.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD MONITOR EACH SCHOOL DISTRICT'S PROGRESS TOWARDS ACHIEVEMENT OF THE GOALS OF THE DISTRICT'S OWN LONG RANGE PLAN. THE MONITORING PLAN SHOULD INCLUDE DETERMINING WHETHER:

(a) THE BASIC SITUATION HAS BEEN ADEQUATELY AND FAIRLY DESCRIBED

(b) THE DISTRICT IS PERFORMING IN ACCORDANCE WITH STATED GOALS

(c) THERE IS A NEED TO MODIFY AND/OR CHANGE THE LONG RANGE PLAN

(d) THE DISTRICT IS MEETING STATE BOARD REGULATIONS AND/OR THE REQUIREMENTS OF STATE LAW

THIS MONITORING SHOULD OCCUR ON A THREE YEAR CYCLE.

The monitoring process need not employ Department of Education personnel in every instance. A variety of approaches to this monitoring process has been suggested throughout this report. The Department should draw upon the experience of educators throughout the Commonwealth. The Department should, however, function in a review capacity. Whenever it appears that the monitoring process is breaking down, it should conduct an investigation to determine the facts and take corrective action.

* * *

Another very serious problem exits in making the governance of the educational system more accountable. It relates to the division of responsibility for the education of institutionalized youth and adults.

Heretofore, the educational programs for persons in hospitals or correctional institutions have been the primary responsibility of the Department of Welfare or the Department of Justice. Such a division of authority for education does not promote educational accountability.

Steps have recently been taken to end this divided allocation of authority for education. The Commission applauds this development. The educational development of institutionalized citizens in the Commonwealth has now been shifted to the Department of Education. This is good. However:

8-13.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD IMMEDIATELY MEET ITS RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF INSTITUTIONALIZED YOUTH AND ADULTS.

It is not enough merely to effect a legal changeover. Action program by the Department in this long-neglected area of education should have a high priority in Department operations. To do less would be to undermine the concepts of accountability to which the Commission is committed.

* * *

Another area of divided responsibility in the governance of education is in the education of the very young child.

Because the Department of Education under current provisions of the School Code has jurisdiction over the education of children only from the time of their enrollment in kindergarten (ages four or five), the educational development of the very young child from birth to age four has been largely overlooked. The Department of Welfare has large programs utilizing federal funds for day care programs for very young children. But its focus has been primarily concerned for the physical and emotional health of these children. Day care programs do not focus on the educational development of children as major goals. There is no standard or overall Commonwealth policy for the kind and quality of education which should be provided for the very young child.

The Commission believes that jurisdiction for the education of the young child should be the primary responsibility of the Department of Education. Therefore:

8-14.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD DEVELOP A MASTER PLAN FOR THE EDUCATION OF THE YOUNG CHILD.

Much debate occurred within the Commission as to what should be the scope and intent of educational programs for the pre-kindergarten child. A particular aspect of this controversy was whether these young children should be enrolled in organized classes or whether the primary emphasis should be on strengthening the parents' ability to pro-

vide the necessary educational development. The Commission believes, however, the subject is of such importance and such complexity that a major study should be undertaken and expert guidance should be obtained in the development of the Department plan. Meeting the physical and emotional needs of young children should be part of this plan. The Department's plan should make adequate provision for cooperation with the Departments of Health and Welfare to ensure that this occurs. But the educational activities should be developed by the Department of Education. The specific provisions of this plan should have built into them the flexibility for optional participation characterized in the discussion of entry into school in the Organization for Instruction chapter.

Improving School Board Operations

The district school board and its large city counterpart the Board of Education are key agencies in the governance of the educational system. The School Code delegates important legislative and judicial functions to the district board. Directors are often responsible for the expenditure of vast sums of money as well as for the raising of the necessary taxes. The quality of the work performed by school boards in the governance process is integral to the establishment of the kind of educational system advocated in other chapters of this report. An informed school board is the basis for the establishment and operation of informed policies at the district level.

* * *

Some school board directors are not well versed on educational issues. Frequently, school board members are employed full time, involved in other civic services, and are too busy to take time out to refresh themselves on current educational trends, statutes, regulations and other pertinent educational issues. Therefore:

8-15.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE THAT ALL SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS HAVE BOTH PRESERVICE AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING.

Preservice training should occur between the time when board members are elected and when they first take office. In-service education should continue throughout the tour of service as a director. The State Board of Education should charge the Department of Education with the responsibility for conducting preservice and in-service training for school board members. The training should include the respective roles of the superintendent and other administrators, business managers, solicitors, and the board itself. Special attention should be paid to the

public employes bargaining law (Act 195) and matters involving financing, revenue raising, and the budget.

* * *

Another way to improve the operation of school boards is to improve the relationship between the school board and its solicitor. Because so many of the school district's actions are now influenced by the status of the law, by regulations of the State Board and by administrative decisions made by the Secretary of Education, the role of the school board solicitor has become increasingly significant.

Section 406 of the School Code[13] provides for the appointment of a solicitor as the chief legal officer for every school board. However, the roles and responsibilities of the solicitor are not clearly specified. In order for solicitors to perform their duties more knowledgeably and to ensure that they are kept aware of current regulations, mandates, and trends, the Commission recommends that:

8-16.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD SEND ALL BASIC EDUCATION CIRCULARS TO ALL SCHOOL BOARD SOLICITORS.

and

8-17.0 THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE COMMONWEALTH SHOULD HOLD SEMI-ANNUAL IN-SERVICE TRAINING SESSIONS FOR SCHOOL BOARD SOLICITORS.

This in-service training conducted by the Attorney General's office would allow solicitors to be introduced further into the workings of the state educational agencies, and permit opportunities for group discussions of common problems and practices.

Increasing Community Involvement in the Governance Process

The governance of the educational system is based on the principle of the representative system of government. Citizens elect members of the General Assembly to represent them in the enactment of legislation to implement the constitutional mandate for operating a state educational system. They also elect a Governor who, in turn, nominates members for the State Board, subject to the approval by the state Senate; he also appoints, with Senate concurrence, a Secretary of Education. At the district level, the representation principle is implemented by the election of school board members (except in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia).[14]

[13] Section 406. Solicitor and Other Appointees. *Public School Code of 1949, as amended.*

[14] See explanation of this situation on pp. 99-100 of this chapter.

Under this representative system of government, citizens who do not hold public office do not directly share power in the operation of the governance system. They share power only indirectly through their ballot. The formal agencies of governance in the educational system could not function at all if the entire population had to be polled every time a decision had to be made. The society is far too complex and populous to operate on the principle of a New England town meeting.

However, the representative system breaks down when there is inadequate opportunity for citizens to make their views known to their representatives. The Commission does not want to abandon the system of representative government. But it does believe that administrators, teachers, parents, students and other citizens have much to contribute to the improvement of the educational system. Such groups should be involved indirectly, but regularly, in the governance process in order to make the systems more effective and more responsive. This would not only remove the serious problems of apathy and alienation which generate a sense of powerlessness, but it should also provide the elected representatives both with additional insights into the problems facing education and with some potential solutions.

Means should be provided for offering interested citizens a chance to be heard in the governance process. Boards alone must still govern, but they should be required to give greater consideration to the views of the public. For these reasons, the Commission offers the recommendations in the following sections.

* * *

The adoption of the annual budget by the district school board is an event of substantial significance. It establishes not only how much money is to be spent, but what additional revenue will be necessary. Citizens of a district are directly affected by the amount of taxes they are to pay whether state or locally imposed. The quality of education made available to their children is a matter of vital concern.

Section 687 of the School Code[15] requires the notification of the preparation of an annual budget 30 days prior to its adoption, with advertisement for a public hearing on the proposed budget scheduled for at least 10 days before final action is taken.

The Commission believes that the present statute does not give sufficient time to citizens for comment on the budget and, therefore, recommends that:

---

[15] Section 687. Annual Budget; Additional or Increased Appropriations; Transfer of Funds. *Public School Code of 1949, as amended.* NOTE: Section 664 of the School Code requires a fifteen day period for first class school districts.

8-18.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD REQUIRE THAT EACH SCHOOL BOARD ISSUE ITS PROPOSED ANNUAL BUDGET 60 DAYS PRIOR TO FINAL ADOPTION AND HOLD PUBLIC HEARINGS ON THAT BUDGET AT LEAST 30 DAYS PRIOR TO ADOPTION.

By increasing the amount of time required for publicizing the budget from 30 to 60 days, it will be possible to involve citizens more adequately in assisting the district to weigh the alternatives it faces in this very important process of determining program priorities. The Commission is aware of the lack of attention currently paid by the citizenry to the budget development process in school districts. However, it believes that until such time as boards and superintendents give this activity the priority this recommendation intends, voter apathy is likely to remain. Where an aroused citizenry already exists, the extended time will permit fuller debate of the merits of the budget over a period longer than the present 30 days. The commitment to extensive involvement of citizens so strongly held by the Commission requires more than *pro forma* efforts at their involvement.

* * *

Greater advance notice on budgets assists citizens in evaluating projected expenditures. Equally valuable as a tool for helping the public judge the use of educational funds is the ability to compare reported expenditures across the Commonwealth. At present, that is difficult since no uniform financial recording and reporting system is required. To simplify record keeping and for more useful public information, the Commission recommends that:

8-19.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE ALL SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO UTILIZE THE SAME METHOD OF REPORTING EXPENDITURES TO THE COMMONWEALTH.

Presently, Philadelphia is not required to use the same method as other districts in reporting expenditures. This causes unnecessary difficulty in analyzing expenditures for education.

* * *

The lack of effort to involve citizens in the governance process has many specific examples. One of the most unfortunate repercussions in this regard is that citizens throughout Pennsylvania frequently complain that while some school boards hold public meeting, some do not allow time for public comment on pertinent matters before the board acts. In the view of the Commision, boards are not functioning adequately if they fail to consult citizens *prior* to making important decisions. School boards should serve as representatives of the people, not as replacements for the people.

To have public meetings without an opportunity for public comment pertaining to the business before the board is to miss an opportunity to broaden the informal means available to citizens to participate, indirectly, in the governance process. Therefore:

8-20.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD REQUIRE THAT ALL SCHOOL BOARDS PROVIDE TIME AT EACH MEETING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT, PRIOR TO ACTION ON THE AGENDA.

Merely providing a period at the close of the business session to "let them sound off" would appear to be a "sop" to the principle of broadening citizen participation. Some reasonable method to permit sample views of the public to be heard at board meetings should be established. These views should be heard before the board acts on its agenda.

* * *

Act 403 of September 28, 1959 requires that "all meetings of governing bodies of political subdivisions and of certain authorities and other agencies performing essential governmental functons shall be open to the public." This law requiring open meetings does not mandate public participation nor prohibit "executive sessions."

The Commission has received widespread testimony that many school boards make their decisions in "executive sessions," closed to the public, and hold perfunctory open meetings only to comply with the law.

The Department of Education, charged with seeing that local districts adhere to the law, should enforce Act 403. Therefore, the Commission recommends that:

8-21.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD ENFORCE THE STATE LAW THAT ALL SCHOOL BOARD MEETINGS BE REQUIRED TO BE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC. THE ONLY EXCEPTIONS TO THIS SHOULD BE THOSE MEETINGS INVOLVING DISCUSSION OF PERSONNEL, LAND ACQUSITIONS, AND CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS.

The exceptions appear to be necessary for the following reasons: personnel—to ensure an individual's right to privacy; land acquisition—to avoid increased cost of acquiring land through speculation; and contract negotiations—to facilitate the negotiation process by providing bargaining sides greater latitude for compromise. It is hoped that school boards observe these three exceptions and that they respond to the law about open meetings in good faith, thus avoiding the need for the Department to intervene.

* * *

If citizens are to have the opportunity to speak at school board meetings and if they are to have the opportunity of monitoring the affairs of the school district, it is important that they know in advance what is on the agenda for a board meeting. Advance notice of the board

agenda is not yet a common practice in Pennsylvania. Therefore, the Commission recommends that:

8-22.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD REQUIRE EVERY SCHOOL BOARD TO MAKE PUBLIC ITS MONTHLY MEETING AGENDA AT LEAST THREE DAYS PRIOR TO THE MEETING.

This agenda should be available in advance at the school board office to any resident and should be distributed to members of the public in attendance at the school board meetings. The predistributed agenda would not only allow citizens to consider ahead of time those items to be discussed, but it would also permit time for preparation of comments. Furthermore:

8-23.0 A SCHOOL BOARD SHOULD NOT VOTE UPON AN ITEM THAT DOES NOT APPEAR ON THE PREVIOUSLY RELEASED AGENDA EXCEPT IN THE CASE OF AN UNFORESEEN EMERGENCY.

Such action is necessary if the concept of the open meeting is to be preserved.

* * *

Another problem in ensuring greater citizen involvement in the informal governance process relates to the public's lack of knowledge of the technicalities of public school administration practices. Often citizens ask for information from the district and get honest answers but in terms which are hard for laymen to understand. This is particularly true in attempts to understand the complicated school budgets used today. Therefore, the Commission recommends:

8-24.0 SCHOOL BOARDS SHOULD PROVIDE ASSISTANCE IN THE INTERPRETATION OF THE BUDGET FOR THE COMMUNITY.

When time comes for the board to place the budget before the public for its examination, it is important that the district make sufficient personnel available to explain the provisions of the budget in terms which are comprehensible to people who are not school accountants.

* * *

Frequently, in response to a particular school problem, school administrators and school boards appoint committees of interested citizens to help solve the problem. The citizens' groups are expected to concentrate on the problem, check public opinion, submit findings, make recommendations, and finally disband. Today, however, the Commission believes that citizens want to be involved not merely in crisis situations, but in a continuing fashion with the whole educational process.

In order to involve more citizens in the informal decision making process affecting education and to bring about a more informed community, the Commission recommends that:

8-25.0 SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHOULD ESTABLISH CITIZENS ADVISORY COUNCILS COMPOSED OF PARENTS, STUDENTS, AND OTHER COMMUNITY PEOPLE WHO WILL ADVISE BOARDS ON MATTERS INVOLVING THE EDUCATIONAL ISSUES AND NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY.

Although the role of the citizens advisory councils would be strictly advisory with no specific power to make educational decisions, the Commission believes that the creation of the councils would increase significantly opportunities for participation by the community in the governing process. The council would create a focal point for public opinion to influence the school board without having the legal power to control decisions of the board. Some of the areas on which citizens advisory councils might advise are: curriculum, evaluation of personnel, budget, educational innovations, drug control, discipline procedures, public relations and long and short term planning. How such councils are structured and for what purposes should be left to the discretion of each district.

* * *

The Commission, by recommending the establishment of citizens advisory councils, is not suggesting that citizen involvement be thus limited. There are numerous other ways to involve citizens in the functioning of the educational system. To increase the extent of such participation, all of the following recommendations are offered.

8-26.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE EACH SCHOOL BOARD TO INVOLVE IN SOME CONTINUING MANNER ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS, STUDENTS, PARENTS AND CITIZENS IN THE PREPARATION OF LONG RANGE EDUCATIONAL PLANS WITH PARTICULAR EMPHASIS ON CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTIONAL ORGANIZATION.

The particular reference to curriculum and instructional organization in this recommendation is made because the Commission has recommended that each school district develop learning outcomes to supplement the state mandated learning outcomes.[16] This involvement of the community in shaping these outcomes is crucial to the ideals of accountability mentioned earlier. Moreover:

8-27.0 EVERY SCHOOL DISTRICT SHOULD DELINEATE A CLEAR, CONTINUOUS, AND REAL ROLE FOR ALL ASPECTS OF THE COMMUNITY IN POLICY-MAKING AND CURRICULUM DESIGNING ACTIVITIES OF THE SCHOOL.

And

---

[16] See also the Curriculum chapter.

8-28.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO PROVIDE THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION WITH EVIDENCE THAT THEIR LONG RANGE PLANNING PROCESSES HAVE INVOLVED REPRESENTATIVES OF THE VARIOUS GROUPS WITHIN THE SCHOOL AND THE COMMUNITY.

And

8-29.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE SCHOOL DISTRICTS' LONG RANGE PLANS TO DEMONSTRATE TO THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION THAT THE EDUCATIONAL, RECREATIONAL, AND OTHER NEEDS AND INTERESTS OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED.

And

8-30.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD INCLUDE THE COMMUNITY AS A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTOR IN SELF STUDY AND DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION EVALUATIONS.

All of these recommendations stress the importance of adopting formal policies or plans for the regular involvement of citizens in the governance process. Unless such formal policies are established little will happen. It is easy to accept the idea of greater community involvement, but it takes careful planning to make such programs work satisfactorily. Good intentions alone are not enough.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the Commission has discussed the role of the formal institutions of governance in the educational system—the General Assembly, the State Board of Education, the Department of Education and Boards of Education and Boards of School Directors.

It has also discussed what should be the desirable relationships of administrators, teachers, parents, students, and interested citizens to the formal governance process. Special attention has been given to these informal relationships.

The Commission believes the basis of operation of the governance system should be the commitment of all the formal and informal groups involved to the principles espoused by this Commission: equality of educational opportunity, flexible and personalized learning, accountability, and community involvement.

If this happens, the governance process will operate more effectively and with increased legitimacy. To do so will engender greater respect for the public agencies charged with operating the system. To negate these principles or to ignore them by a mindless commitment to the status quo will further undermine the credibility necessary for maintaining and improving the system.

A governance system can only function if it has the respect of the citizens.

To increase this respect has been the intention of the Commission, thereby not only ensuring in the Commonwealth a "thorough and efficient" system but one beneficial to all.

Chapter IX

Supportive Services

Introduction

In a broad and important sense, everything in the school but the pupil is a supportive service—supportive, that is, of personalized student learning.

But the term "supportive services" has a more specialized usage as well. Educators generally apply it to a more or less agreed upon cluster of school activities which, in this context, are defined as noninstructional:

a. guidance services
b. health services
c. transportation services
d. library and media services
e. social work services
f. psychological services
g. food services[1]

These are the services with which this chapter is concerned. More specifically, using this classification as a reference point, the Commission has asked two questions: what kinds of supportive services should be provided, and how should they be delivered?

The kinds of supportive services that a school system requires depends—or ought to—on what education is expected to be and do. Historically, as long as schools were viewed primarily as places for instruction in the 3 R's, public education had no need for such people as counselors and school nurses. In this century, though, the public has come to expect more from schools—particularly, more in the way of social services. Schools have been called upon to treat health needs, to feed children, and to transport them to and from school. Put another way, an unprecedented growth has taken place in supportive services, a growth which reflects the questionable belief that schools

[1] The Commission makes no specific recommendations on the expansion of school-operated food programs. At the same time, the Commission recognizes that the provision of food programs is a critical service for some children. Consequently, it has included these programs in its health services recommendations (9-15.0, 9-16.0).

are *the* social institution with responsibility and capacity for providing for the general welfare of children. One educator has described the development this way:

> The growth of school systems has meant the progressive expansion of schools to encompass more and more of what, in the early years of the nation, was a function of other institutions or informal arrangements. When the family fails, the school must fill the gap. When industrial society renders it no longer possible to carry on education through the apprentice system, and factories become miseducative environments, then the school must fill the gap. And so education becomes institutionally separated from the educative processes that go on elsewhere. Then compulsory attendance, joined with an extended period of schooling, means that children are under the care of schools for more and more purposes over an increasing span of their lives.[2]

The direction of this Commission has been to oppose that drift, to say, in effect, that there are some things that schools can do very well—and some very good things that schools cannot do very well at all, and that the two must be distinguished. The Commission has used this yardstick: those activities which have a *direct impact* on the essential *learning* processes of individuals are best and most properly considered the school's responsibility. Those programs should be strengthened. On the other hand, the school should not undertake primary responsibility for broad-based social problems . . . although it should not perpetuate those problems either.

What can supportive services reasonably be expected to achieve? They can be invaluable in personalizing education and making it more flexible. They can provide students with the kind of help in selecting programs and courses that encourages individual development and discourages binding and premature decisions. They can provide a variety of learning resources, so that, to the greatest extent possible, each child's learning style is accommodated. They can influence curriculum by championing people over systems. By monitoring and influencing administrative patterns, by assuring that the focus is always on the student, they can help maintain in our schools what Paul Goodman calls "a possible environment"[3] in which individual people can learn.

At the same time, some supportive services—guidance and library services in particular—also teach skills. They do this by encouraging students to recognize the value of, and to acquire techniques for, search-

---

[2] Thomas F. Green, "Schools and Communities: A Look Forward," *Harvard Educational Review*, 39, 2 (Spring, 1969), 228.

[3] Paul Goodman, "Compulsory Miseducation," in *Compulsory Miseducation and The Community of Scholars* (New York, 1962), p. 39.

ing out and critically evaluating information and for making realistic and successful personal decisions. These lessons, critical in our present society, will become more and more essential as the nature of our social structure becomes more complex and our fund of knowledge more extensive.

School Libraries

The wisely used library symbolizes the kind of educational process which this Commission endorses for Pennsylvania's schools: flexible and personalized learning. Seen as a place where a student carries on self-directed and self-paced study, the library represents the important educational goal of independence, of critical-minded exploration and discovery among a wide variety of points of view. Seen as the total fluid collection of learning resources in the school, the library reflects the diversity of instructional media and approaches necessary to meet the various learning styles and achievement levels present in every group of students. Indeed, it may be that no other school activity normally described as "supportive" has the potential impact on learning that the school library has.

But to say all of this is only to reiterate a platitude. The unfortunate reality is that, rather than the dynamic learning center of our schools, the library has tended to be peripheral. At its dreariest, it is an enforced study hall where restless and bored students mark time.

This is no new problem. It was recognized by the Lawrence commission[4] in 1961, when that body recommended special librarian subsidies and minimum state standards for school library programs, the real beginning of a Commonwealth push for strengthened libraries. The problem is recognized in the existence of State Board of Education regulations for library personnel and collection size. Recently, the discussions on creating an "open college" in Pennsylvania have brought to light again the inability and unreadiness of some school libraries to support educational innovation. Recurrent in the Commission's public hearing were certain observations touching on school library programs:

a. that some libraries still lack adequate physical facilities

b. that many libraries are still book-oriented, to the relative exclusion of other media useful in instruction

c. that many library collections are not coordinated with curricular needs

---

[4] The Committee on Education, appointed by David L. Lawrence, Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (1960-61).

d. that library collections tend to lack information on the achievements of women and minorities

and, perhaps most significant of all,

e. that our schools fail to teach people to think and pursue knowledge independently.

This last criticism, while not directed specifically at school libraries, may be the most telling of all testimony to our failure to integrate into the total school process the educational values which the library represents.

* * *

Strengthening the role of the library in the school's curriculum has been a major concern of this Commission. If the types of learning processes envisioned in the Curriculum and Organization for Instruction chapters of this report are to be realized, the library must indeed become

> . . . a learning laboratory where the use of all resources, print and nonprint, is purposeful, planned and integrated with the teaching and learning program to widen, deepen, intensify and individualize the educational experience.[5]

Too often, however, school personnel, including librarians themselves, are ill-prepared to support and utilize this potential of the library. The following three recommendations bear directly on strengthening the curricular role of the library:

9-1.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD ENCOURAGE INCREASED AND PERIODIC PRESERVICE AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS IN THE SELECTION AND APPROPRIATE USE OF ALL TYPES OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS IN RELATION TO CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES.

9-2.0 WHILE THE SCHOOL BOARD HAS FINAL LEGAL AUTHORITY, TEACHERS AND LIBRARIANS SHOULD HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO MAKE DECISIONS ON THE SELECTION AND PURCHASE OF LIBRARY AND INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS FOR THEIR SCHOOLS.

And, because the Commission accepts Ruth Ann Davies'[6] reasoning that "The administrator who values the library as an integral part of the educational program will expect the librarian to take an active part

---

[5] School Library Standards, Pennsylvania Department of Education: Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1972.

[6] Ruth Ann Davies, *The School Library: A Force for Educational Excellence* (New York, 1969).

in all phases of curriculum study and revision,"[7] the Commission recommends that:

9-3.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD REQUIRE THAT CERTIFICATION OF THE PERSON CHARGED WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY OF COORDINATING AND SUPERVISING THE LIBRARY PROGRAM (WHETHER ON THE BUILDING OR ON THE DISTRICT LEVEL) BE BASED UPON THE FOLLOWING COMPETENCIES:

(a) MEDIA SELECTION, USE AND COORDINATION WITH CURRICULUM

(b) INSTRUCTIONAL ORGANIZATION; HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

(c) INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION AND COORDINATION

(d) RESEARCH

(e) LIBRARY MANAGEMENT

The two recommendations which follow are facilitative in nature. They are closely tied in spirit to recommendations such as the one on the year-round use of facilities[8] which are designed to make the greatest possible variety of resources as accessible as possible:

9-4.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD ENCOURAGE COOPERATIVE SCHOOL-COMMUNITY LIBRARY RELATIONSHIPS AND FACILITIES, AND, IN CONJUNCTION WITH OTHER APPROPRIATE AGENCIES AND THE INTERMEDIATE UNITS, SHOULD PROVIDE PLANNING AND EVALUATION ASSISTANCE FOR THESE PURPOSES.

9-5.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD ENCOURAGE SCHOOLS TO MAKE LIBRARY FACILITIES AVAILABLE AT TIMES OTHER THAN, AND IN ADDITION TO, THE REGULAR INSTRUCTIONAL DAY. SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHOULD USE VOLUNTEERS AND PARAPROFESSIONALS TO IMPLEMENT THIS PROCESS.

Finally, the Commission recognizes that the library, seen as the total collection of instructional resources, can play an important part in helping all students appreciate the contributions of all facets of society. This would be a significant contribution to the personalization of instruction and the provision of equal educational opportunity. Consequently, the Commission recommends that:

9-6.0 SCHOOL LIBRARY MATERIALS SHOULD DEPICT WOMEN AND MINORITY GROUPS FAIRLY IN A VARIETY OF ROLES AND SHOULD INCLUDE DISCUSSIONS OF THE HISTORY AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THESE GROUPS.

Guidance

Just as library services should assure the personalization of learning materials, guidance services should promote the child-centeredness of

[7] Davies, p. 41.

[8] See Organization for Instruction chapter, Recommendation 5-4.0.

instructional environments. The need for specialized personnel in this effort has been a fairly recent development. School guidance programs received their great impetus only in 1958 with the National Defense Education Act and they still are not mandated by the Commonwealth. It is a sign of our schools' desire to meet the individual learning needs of individual students that virtually all secondary and many elementary programs provide guidance services.

If a school offers a guidance program, it must meet the general regulations in the Pennsylvaina Code,[9] which provide for a system of program approval, the designation of a coordinator, and a "coordinated program of guidance services which is complementary and integral to the instructional programs." School counselors (there were 2,998 in 1971-72) must be certified from state-approved counselor education programs. The Department of Education performs the functions of program approval, federal-state liaison, and development, improvement, research evaluation and consultation services.

Largely because of the relative newness of guidance programs, their proper role in education is a subject of lively debate. This is particularly true of the school counselor. Consequently, the main focus of this Commission in examining school guidance has been to find and encourage the most effective use of the counselor, the cornerstone of the guidance program.

The Commission believes that the function of the counselor should evolve toward that of an advisor to the learning process, in which counselors have heretofore been only partially involved. To parallel and complement the changing role of the teacher[10], the counselor should be in a position to affect groups of students as well as individuals and to affect more directly the learning dynamics in the school as a whole. Someone, for example, is needed to ensure that student decisions concerning courses of study are made wisely, and only when students are prepared to make them. Someone should be available to consult with teachers about learning problems in individual classes. (There is every indication that teachers would welcome such assistance.) The following recommendations are made in order to encourage this concept:

5-7.0 THE FUNCTION OF THE SCHOOL COUNSELOR SHOULD BE REINTERPRETED TO BE THAT OF A LEARNING ADVISOR.

---

[9] Title 22. Pennsylvania Code. Sections 7.11-7.13.

[10] See Organization for Instruction chapter, recommendation 5-1.5.

Title 22, Pennsylvania Code, Section 7.13, should be changed to read:

The following elements of a coordinated program of guidance services, which is integral to the instructional program, shall be provided in all schools of the Commonwealth, with appropriate application to the characteristics of the children to be served, and to the educational setting in which they are proffered:

a. A clear, continuous and purposeful role in the development of curriculum to assure that the overall intentions of the school are compatible with the best development of children; to protect the student from premature decisions with lasting repercussions; to champion flexibility in curricular design.

b. Continuous, frequent and significant consultation with teachers on learning and emotional problems in the classroom to assure an optimal emotional and learning environment; to increase the individualization of instruction and to provide on-the-spot in-service assistance to the teacher in understanding the dynamics of the classroom.

c. A continuous and coordinated system of consultation with students, individually and in groups and in a variety of settings, to provide assistance in the formulation of values and goals, the understanding of problems and the cultivation of the ability to enjoy variety in experience, with full confidentiality.

d. The maintenance of a continuous and purposeful program of career guidance, conducted in coordination with all aspects and levels of the instructional program of the school to assure that all students are introduced to generalized concepts of career education, to assure that the full resources of the community are marshaled in the development of career education to assure that every student has a realistic view of the world of work and of his or her options within it.

e. Liaison with community and intermediate unit agencies and referral sources to assure that problems exceeding the capability of schools receive the professional assistance they deserve.

f. The creation of an environment in which peer counseling can play an effective part.

g. Continuous communication with teachers, administrators, other pupil personnel specialists and parents relating to student needs, educational objectives and student progress.

h. Sufficient qualified staff to maintain a continuous, articulated system of relevant and accurate pupil educational records (to follow guidelines developed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education) to provide placement assistance and to administer follow-up studies under the direction of the guidance counselor.

And to further strengthen this function:

9-8.0 SCHOOLS SHOULD USE DIFFERENTIATED STAFFING IN SCHOOL COUNSELING.

That is, schools may wish to make use of different people with different talents and skills to meet the range of functions necessary in school counseling. Differentiated staffing is the concept of distinguishing functions (according to training) among people working in the same general area. It calls for salary differentiation in terms of responsibilities assumed and seeks to make fuller use of auxiliary personnel while recognizing differing interest and ability levels of staff members.

* * *

Closely related to the use of differentiated staffing is another issue: the use of noncertified personnel. Counselor-student ratios remain high: 2,988 full-time counselors for 2,370,665 students in 1971-72, resulting in an elementary ratio of 1:2058, a secondary ratio of 1:469 and a combined ratio of 1:791. There are not presently in our schools certified counselors in sufficient numbers to implement differentiated staffing patterns. Moreover, if the Commonwealth is to move in this direction, it must surely want to capitalize on available "guidance" experience outside of the educational community, particularly, in the form of people whose experience in business may have equipped them with valuable expertise in career guidance. Therefore, the Commission recommends that:

9-9.0. THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD PERMIT SCHOOLS TO EMPLOY QUALIFIED BUT NONCERTIFIED PERSONNEL IN GUIDANCE SERVICES AS LONG AS THESE PEOPLE WORK UNDER THE IMMEDIATE SUPERVISION OF A CERTIFIED COUNSELOR.

And to give this program regional support:

9-10.0 INTERMEDIATE UNIT BOARDS SHOULD INVESTIGATE AND IMPLEMENT PLANS FOR MAINTAINING EDUCATIONAL GUIDANCE FIELD TEAMS AND CLINICS AT THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT LEVEL TO PROVIDE IN-DEPTH GUIDANCE WHERE NEEDED AND TO SUPPORT THE WORK OF THE SCHOOL COUNSELOR.

* * *

In strengthening the role of the counselor, attention must be paid to the groups of children with whom the counselor works. Existing

guidance programs are directed primarily to older students, partly because they have pressing curriculum and career concerns and partly because they are at the age where learning problems manifest themselves dramatically in behavior problems. If, however, guidance is to be, not crisis-oriented, but primarily developmental in nature, the counselor must be more intimately involved with learning dynamics and at an earlier point in the child's educational career. As a 1966 federal report concluded, it is of paramount importance ". . . that additional attention be given to increase the readiness of every child to learn from the day he first enters school . . . ."[11] For this reason:

9-11.0 THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD ENCOURAGE, AND SCHOOL BOARDS SHOULD DEVELOP, STRONGER ELEMENTARY GUIDANCE PROGRAMS.

* * *

Finally, in school guidance, as in library programs, an important chance and responsibility exists to promote equal educational opportunity. Good guidance programs can give students the information and confidence to aspire beyond career restrictions which may traditionally have been placed upon their race, ethnic group, or sex. Following, then, the lead of such groups as the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education[12], on a nationwide level, and the Joint Task Force on Sexism in Education[13], in Pennsylvaina, the Commission recommends that:

9-12.0 SCHOOL GUIDANCE MATERIALS SHOULD PRESENT WOMEN AND MINORITY GROUPS FAVORABLY IN A VARIETY OF OCCUPATIONS, AND CAREER COUNSELING SHOULD ENCOURAGE INVESTIGATION OF NONTRADITIONAL CAREER OPTIONS FOR ALL PEOPLE.

The Community

Throughout this report, the Commission has affirmed its belief that central to the strength of our school system is its public character, and that we must learn to build upon this asset as we seek to improve education. It is appropriate and essential that we recognize the community as one of the most important supportive resources available to our schools.

---

[11] Hyruna M. Smith and Louise O. Eckerson, *Guidance Services in Elementary Schools*, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D. C., 1966.

[12] Sixth Report of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, *Counseling and Guidance: A Call for Change*, Washington, D. C., June 1, 1972.

[13] *Sexism in Education: Joint Task Force Report.* Pennsylvania Department of Education: Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1972.

There are a number of very good reasons why schools should make substantial use of community resources. Sound and realistic educational policy dictates that the school cannot be specialist in all fields, cannot in isolation provide all the kinds of experiences that we think children ought to have. Good management principles suggest that expertise, wherever found, should be utilized. Successful public relations require that the community be involved in the schools. In every sense the community is one of the potentially most powerful support resources of the school.

Nevertheless, schools' ventures into cooperative relationships with the public have been limited and fragmentary. Community ability is generally exclu d for the lack of something called certification; work-study programs touch only a small per cent of our students.[14] The community-school, a concept that seeks to unite in a total and systematic way the needs and talents of both the school and the community, is still a rare phenomenon, even though successful where it exists.

The possibilities for sustained school-community relationships are limited only by the exact nature of the community and the imagination of the planners. Obviously, museums, libraries, fine arts centers and scientific academies must be visited. Poets and musicians and painters should be brought into the classroom. But there is a danger in seeing the community only in its most glamorous aspects and in thinking of school-community experiences only as sporadic forays into the world beyond the school building. Every community has access to courts, hospitals, corrections agencies, religious institutions, businesses and industries and community action groups. One of the most important resources of every community is parents. Many Pennsylvaina towns are surrounded by farms and orchards, with all the knowledge of economy, practical arts and agriculture which are found there. National and state parks and forestry camps teach more eloquently than any textbook the lessons of ecology and survival.

More important, however, than pointing out the variety of community resources is exploring the use of these people and facilities in expanded ways. The Commission believes that the occasional day-long field trip is insufficient to meet the goal of utilizing community potential. It urges the involvement of the community in the schools on a regular, planned and sustained basis. The Commission recognizes that the foundation for this already exists in, for example, the inclusion of transportation "field trip" expenses under the instructional subsidy[15], in

[14] 1969 Educational Quality Assessment indicates that only about 1/3 of Pennsylvania's secondary schools use work experience programs regularly.

[15] Title 22. Pennsylvania Code. Section 11.26. Chapter 11, Pupil Attendance, adopted by the State Board of Education May 11, 1973.

the regulation which permits noncertified personnel to teach up to 300 hours a year[16], and in the relaxed restriction on leasing facilities for school purposes.[17] To encourage this kind of flexibilty, the Commission recommends that:

9-13.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD CONTINUE AND EXPAND THE CONCEPT OF PROGRAM APPROVAL TO PERMIT SCHOOLS AS MUCH FLEXIBILITY AS POSSIBLE IN UTILIZING COMMUNITY RESOURCES TO MEET SPECIFIC CURRICULUM OBJECTIVES.

In a later section of this chapter are recommendations to provide schools with help in learning how to develop and implement programs of increased community participation.

* * *

One aspect of this issue is the use of paraprofessionals. In various sections of this report, the Commission has made recommendations which imply the involvement of more and more noncertified adults in the educational process. This should not be construed as an assault upon the ranks of professional educators. Rather, it is a reaffirmation of one of the findings of the White House Conference on Youth, 1971, that ". . . interaction between diverse peoples [can] greatly enhance the entire experience of learning." That report spells it out further: "Businessmen, housewives, laborers and all other members of the community could facilitate the education of their young people."[18] The Commission recommends that:

9-14.0 SCHOOLS SHOULD MAKE EXPANDED USE OF VOLUNTEERS AND PARAPROFESSIONALS.

The statement of licensure or certification of paraprofessionals set forth in the Department of Education Guidelines for paraprofessionals well states the Commission's position:

> Educational paraprofessionals shall not be licensed nor issued any form of state educational agency certificate attesting to qualification to perform such duties in any school of the Commonwealth. However, local agencies or institutions of higher education conducting training programs for paraprofessionals may provide a "Certificate of Satisfactory Completion" which should indicate

---

[16] Title 22. Pennsylvania Code. Section 49.62. Chapter 49, Professional Personnel, adopted by the State Board of Education March 13, 1970.

[17] Act No. 89 and Act No. 323 (1972).

[18] Report of the White House Conference on Youth, April 18-22, 1971, Estes Park, Colorado, April 18-22, 1971. Available from the United States Printing Office.

those specific skill competencies achieved. Such a certificate may be construed by a prospective employer as an agency or institutional recommendation and endorsement.[19]

Health Services

There can be no doubt that the sick, malnourished, or emotionally disturbed child does not have an equal educational opportunity. Neither can there be any serious doubt that the Commonwealth must play a strong role in protecting a child's right to good health. Indeed, Pennsylvania has recognized its responsibility in this area, both within the Department of Education (by legislative mandate in the School Code and through the educational policy embodied in the Ten Goals of Quality Education) and through the programs and activities of other state agencies.

Although Article XIV of the *Public School Code of 1949, as amended,* assigns to the Secretary of Education responsibility only for the educational and teaching aspects of health services, schools in fact bear a heavy financial burden for a wide range of clinical screening and clerical activities. Of the almost $30 million spent in the Commonwealth for school health services in 1970-71, individual school districts stood approximately $17 million of the cost. This situation can be attributed at least in part to the split authority over school health programs. While the school districts operate these programs, standards and reimbursement are the function, as they most properly should be, of the Pennsylvania Department of Health.

This creates a problem which involves more than just money. Citing a New York study, the August, 1972 issue of *Nation's Schools* identifies the problem of skill utilization, that is, the problem that school nurses spend much of their time attending to essentially clerical duties.[20]

Furthermore, the Commission believes that the separation of the school health services from direct contact with the Department of Health has hindered them from making full use of available community health resources. Rather than improving existing facilities, new ones are constructed on school premises, facilities which are sacrificed to fulfill urgent instructional needs. Conversely, placing such minimal facilities in schools has contributed to community apathy about the creation of adequate, broad-based community health resources.

---

[19] *Guidelines for Program Development, Employment and Utilization of Educational Paraprofessionals,* Pennsylvania Department of Education: Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1972.

[20] "Ideas to Cut Costs: Individual School Nurses: Save 50%," *Nation's Schools,* 90, 2 (August, 1972), 32.

The question is not whether health services should be provided in schools. The value of trained medical personnel in the school has been attested to over the last 40 years. The Commission stresses the importance of school nurses and the need for them to be free to offer the best health care to children and to influence the entire health climate of the school.

But, health care for children goes beyond the confines of the school and good health care depends upon the ability of school *and* community agencies to combine and coordinate their resources to meet particular local needs. School health, the Commission believes, must be seen as an integral part of a total health effort.

The Commission concludes that, in the final years of this century, the health needs of children can best be met by organizing health care in a way that can easily cross school lines, making the greatest possible use of community and state health facilities and expertise. The first step in this direction is state level reorganization. Therefore:

9-15.0 THE DEPARTMENTS OF HEALTH AND WELFARE SHOULD ASSUME THE PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT, IMPLEMENTATION, ADMINISTRATION AND FUNDING FOR SCHOOL HEALTH SERVICES (MENTAL AND PHYSICAL, INCLUDING FOOD PROGRAMS), SCHOOL PSYCHIATRIC SERVICES AND SCHOOL SOCIAL WORK SERVICES.[21]

To provide for effective interagency communication and needs assessment:

9-16.0 A PERMANENT COUNCIL COMPOSED OF EDUCATION, HEALTH AND WELFARE REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD ADVISE THE ONGOING COORDINATION OF HEALTH, PSYCHIATRIC AND SOCIAL WORK SERVICES IN THE SCHOOL.

In the past, nursing positions have been mandated in schools on the basis of a nurse-to-pupil ratio (1:1500).[22] The result is that many nurses divide their time among several school buildings and may not be immediately available to meet emergency needs. The Commission believes that, to supplement regular health care services, people trained in first aid procedures should be present in every school building at all times during the regular instructional day. Therefore:

9-17.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD AMEND THE SCHOOL CODE TO REQUIRE ONE QUALIFIED FIRST AID PERSON IN EVERY SCHOOL BUILDING.

---

[21] A similar commission in Florida has recommended: "The legislature should assign the responsibility for the planning and delivery of health care services in the schools to the Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services." *Improving Education in Florida,* Governor's Citizens Committee on Education: Tallahassee, Florida, March 15, 1973.

[22] Section 1402. Health Services. *Public School Code of 1949, as amended.*

Transportation

Until a very few years ago, the transportation of students to and from the school building was probably the most decidedly uncontroversial activity public education performed. No longer. Alarm over vehicle safety, deep concern about racism in America, and the continually rising cost of education have made this the battleground of uncountable social and educational forces. At this point in the history of American education, it is difficult to think about busing without thinking about the many troubles which plague our society as a whole.

Nevertheless, school transportation is a mandated service. The school district must transport elementary students who live more than 1½ miles from the nearest school, secondary students who live more than 2 miles from the school, students who must travel "hazardous" routes to school and, on an equal basis with services provided to public school students, nonpublic school students within ten miles of the district's boundaries. Increasingly, schools must also bus in compliance with civil rights decisions.

The financial and logistical problems which face individual school districts as they undertake busing programs are many: noncomputerized scheduling is tedious and time consuming; separate district scheduling often results in overlapping routes on district borders; the number of bused miles is steadily increasing; the costs of busing have increased 77 per cent in the last five years; state reimbursement is frequently inadequate, causing a sacrifice of the local instructional budget, and is sometimes unequal between rural, suburban and urban areas; the need for maintenance of purchased buses and the question of whether to buy or lease buses carries the district into areas far beyond strictly educational concerns and presents them with the difficulty of finding and hiring people competent in those areas; providing adequate training programs for drivers and monitors adds more costs to the school budget. And the list goes on.

The time has come to reexamine and reevaluate the delivery of this supportive service. The task is analogous with that represented by school health services: it is an activity carried on by school districts but governed in large part by a state agency other than the Department of Education. (Appropriately, the Department of Transportation enforces safety regulations.) Additionally, school transportation is a service which is being asked to carry an increasingly heavy and controversial social service responsibility. The Commission has taken into account all of these present complexities, as well as our desires to increase safety and efficiency, and to meet broad mass transit needs in

the future, in order to produce the design for an effective transportation system in the last quarter of this century.

To achieve these ends, the Commonwealth recommends that Pennsylvania begin to move toward coordinating pupil transportation on the basis of larger units. Specifically:

> 9-18.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SHOULD ASSUME THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION WITH FULL FUNDING BY THE COMMONWEALTH, AND SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHOULD REPRESENT THEIR NEEDS TO PENNDOT THROUGH THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD STRENGTHEN LAWS PERTINENT TO SCHOOL BUS SAFETY TO ENABLE THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO BE EVEN MORE VIGOROUS IN ITS PURSUIT OF STUDENT SAFETY.

This kind of reorganization has reaped benefits in other states. A 1968 national study, *Structuring Education for Business Management*, concludes that:

> An area or intermediate unit could well . . . use computers to develop bus routes, [and be responsible for] training of bus drivers, inspection services, purchase of buses on an area wide basis, approval of special transportation contracts and maintenance services for transportation equipment.[23]

In its first year, one state found that a regional system reduced the number of buses required, increased carrying efficiency, reduced riding time, and decreased costs.[24]

Equally important, however, are the collateral advantages to be gained. Giving full responsibility to the Department of Transportation should increase its ability to oversee and enforce safety measures. It might well be a first step toward more effective use of buses for the full community—for the aged, for example.

This reorganization also has important implications for racial integration in Pennsylvania schools. Human Relations Commission decisions which require busing for implementation have many times placed a difficult financial and logistical burden on individual districts. Statewide funding and cordination of pupil transportation would ease that situation. In the interim, however, the Commission suggests that districts under mandates of state agencies to bus for racial integration receive state aid for doing so.

---

[23] Robert L. Whitt, *Structuring Education for Business Management* (Great Plains School District Organization Project: Lincoln, Neb., 1968), p. 14.

[24] John M. Parsons, "Ohio's System of Regional Coordinators for Pupil Transportation," *Journal of State School Systems Development*, 1, 2 (Summer, 1967), 104-16.

Intermediate Units

Established in 1970, the intermediate unit (IU) makes up the third organizational level in the Pennsylvania public school system: state department, intermediate unit, school district. The present 29 intermediate units are not regional offices of the Department of Education, however. These are service organizations created to help equalize school district ability to provide key educational support activities:

a. curricular development and instructional improvement
b. educational planning services
c. instructional materials services
d. continuing professional education services
e. pupil personnel services
f. state and federal agency liaison services
g. management services

Clearly, the IU's have a critical role to play in our educational system. Not only facilitators of existing educational programs:

9-19.0 INTERMEDIATE UNIT BOARDS SHOULD TAKE AN AGGRESSIVE AND FORWARD LOOKING ROLE IN SERVICE PLANNING AND DELIVERY.

In the short time in which they have existed, IU's have demonstrated themselves capable of providing constituent districts with assistance in areas ranging from curriculum innovation to bulk purchasing to audio/visual equipment coordination. It is in recognition of the potential of the intermediate units to increase the effectiveness of supportive service delivery that the Commission has recommended that they assume additional responsibilities in the areas of guidance and transportation.[25] The Commission encourages both school districts and the IU's themselves to see the intermediate unit as a valuable agent for educational improvement.

* * *

The Commission regards the in-service function of the IU as especially important in this respect. The current trend toward establishing active IU in-service councils is a recognition of the value of regional coordination of continuing education resources and programs. It is urged that the IU's expand further into this area:

9-20.0 AS A PART OF ITS SERVICE FUNCTION, THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT SHOULD ASSUME THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR ORGANIZING AND SPONSORING PROGRAMS TO PROVIDE A CONTINUOUS UPDATING OF THE PROFESSION.

---

[25] See recommendations 9-10.0 and 9-18.0.

9-20.1 SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS MEMORANDUM 557[25], WHICH ESTABLISHES GUIDELINES FOR APPROVAL OF IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS, SHOULD BE THE MODEL FOR THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT.

So that in-service programs may meet real needs and draw upon all available resources effectively:

9-20.2 REPRESENTATIVES OF THE DISTRICT'S SCHOOL BOARD, ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS' ORGANIZATIONS, STUDENTS, THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT, INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING, PARENTS AND OTHER COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS SHOULD BE INVOLVED AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THESE PROGRAMS.

9-20.3 INTERMEDIATE UNITS AND/OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHOULD ESTABLISH CONTINUOUS, INTENSIVE, IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR ADMINISTRATORS AT ALL LEVELS. ADMINISTRATORS SHOULD CONSIDER PARTICIPATION IN THESE PROGRAMS AS PART OF THEIR JOB RESPONSIBILITY.

9-20.4 THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT SHOULD PROVIDE THE FACILITIES, RESOURCES AND HUMAN SERVICES NEEDED TO ACCOMPLISH THEIR IN-SERVICE TRAINING.

In addition, the Commission sees the IU in-service function as having important implications for the fuller use of community resources and recommends:

9-20.5 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND THE INTERMEDIATE UNITS SHOULD DEVELOP IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS ON UTILIZATION OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES.

As the intermediate units become more heavily involved in the provision of services, they will need more adequate channels of communication with state level resources. To assist in meeting this need:

9-21.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD ADEQUATELY STAFF ITS EXISTING DIVISION OF INTERMEDIATE UNITS.

Finally, the Commission feels that the name "intermediate unit" does not satisfactorily convey the functions of this structure. Therefore:

9-22.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD CHANGE THE NAME OF THE INTERMEDIATE UNIT TO "INTERMEDIATE SERVICE UNIT."

Conclusion

It is common to think of the learning process as the interaction which occurs between classroom teacher and pupil. If education is to meet the challenge it faces, however, such generalized assumptions about

---

[25] School Administrators' Memorandum 557: "Approval of In-Service Activities for Certification Credit," Pennsylvania Department of Education: Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, October 23, 1972.

learning patterns should change. Schools must look first to the uniqueness of the individual student, and the educational system must follow from there, being sufficiently flexible to provide whatever learning resources that uniqueness requires. This was the essence of the PARC[27] decision in terms of the mentally retarded children of the Commonwealth. We must apply the principle to all students.

The image to be encouraged, then, is that of a child who, at any step in the progress from entry into school until graduation, may choose from a variety of learning resources, techniques and strategies, and who has appropriate guidance from such people as teachers and counselors to choose wisely.

This has profound implications for supportive services. "Supportive" has traditionally meant "secondary," not directly involved in the learning process. Indeed, supportive services have in fact been secondary as long as the learning process has been assumed to occur between teacher and student almost exclusively. But once schools commit themselves to the values of variety and personalization, these services—good counseling, strong libraries, the community—become primary learning resources. In this chapter, the Commission has described the new activities which those services might assume as they move toward this status. What becomes clear is that those activities are wide in their scope and enormous in their range, that they have great potential to help personalize learning. Hindering the development of that potential is only our failure to recognize it.

---

[27] *Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.* On May 5, 1972 the federal district court for eastern Pennsylvania made final the order, injunction, stipulation and consent agreement, which guaranteed the right to a free public education for all mentally retarded children regardless of the degree of mental retardation and accompanying handicap.

Chapter X

Finance

Introduction

The problems of finance affect all other aspects of the education system. While limitless funding will not assure quality education, such education is impossible or at least difficult to attain without adequate funding. Matters such as staffing, curriculum, facilities, teacher qualifications eventually lead to the question of cost: How much is necessary? How much can be afforded? How are programs to be funded? What taxes are to be imposed and by which level of government? Every state in the nation is wrestling with problems of school finance. Current practices are being challenged in major studies by nationally recognized authorities, as well as by a number of court decisions.

The financing of elementary and secondary education in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is a $3 billion enterprise. Of this total, about six per cent comes from the federal government, about 49 per cent from the Commonwealth, and about 45 per cent from local revenues. This spending supports an educational system for almost 2.4 million public school students in 505 school districts in the Commonwealth. There are also approximately 450,000 nonpublic school students who receive some services funded by the Commonwealth.

Education occupies a unique position among the functions of state and local government in Pennsylvania: it is the only explicitly mandated state public service. It has been the constitutional responsibility of the Commonwealth to support public education since 1874. Administrative responsibility is delegated by the General Assembly to local school districts, to which the Commonwealth has furnished some financial support since the very early part of the 19th century. Major restructuring of the school finance system took place in 1921, 1945 and again in 1965.

Over the years, the state share of the aggregate cost of public elementary-secondary education has increased. It now exceeds the local share and, together with federal contributions, finances over half of educational expenditures. Nevertheless, there are serious questions about the future financial stability of the Commonwealth's school systems. The continuing increases in teachers' salaries create the single greatest strain on educational funding. The passage of Act 195, legal-

izing collective bargaining for teachers, highlights this situation.[1] Another difficulty is the inability of districts to raise local revenues to meet increased costs. A third problem is continued reliance on the property tax, which is particularly burdensome to the old, the retired, and the poor. Finally, the continuity of federal funding is so precarious from year to year that, in fact, sharp fluctuation in federal funds often proves disastrous to some districts. All of these problems are part of the larger question of how to ensure equal educational opportunity for every child in the Commonwealth, regardless of family wealth or geographical location.

This Commission has been mindful of the important issues that must be addressed if Pennsylvania is to provide quality educational opportunities for every child. In the succeeding sections of this chapter, approaches to solving some of the more significant issues have been proposed. If adopted, they should aid in creating greater taxpayer equity and providing greater financial security for school districts in their ability to deliver educational programs.

Federal Support of Education

Before proceeding to an analysis of both the present situation and some of the recommendations offered by the Commission, it is appropriate to consider the question of federal financing and its role in education in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The Commission has made no formal recommendation on this matter. However, it was believed that it was important to address some of the related issues.

Education is the largest expenditure category in the Commonwealth's general fund budget, amounting to more than one-half of the total. However, educational expenditures constitute a small portion of the federal government budget. For the last five to ten years, educators on both the state and local levels have denounced this discrepancy. The outcry has arisen as more resources have been sought to improve the quality particularly of poor and urban educational systems throughout the country. Various commissions and authorities have recommended that the federal government should assume up to one-third the cost of the total operating budgets of school districts throughout the country by 1980.[2] However, for many school districts, the share

---

[1] The Public Employes Relation Act of 1970, commonly known as Act 195, made professional educational employes eligible for collective bargaining. It has caused a far-reaching reorganization of the relationships between school districts and their professional employes.

[2] Sidney Marland, former Commissioner of Education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, recommended this level of funding as early as 1969.

of federal funds has declined, both in percentage and in dollar amount, over the last few years.

The Commission believes that it is essential that federal funding be increased significantly in the coming years if equal educational opportunity is to become a reality. This increased aid should be in the form of general purpose funds rather than exclusive categorical aid.

Categorical aid has often been a very valuable tool. It has fostered innovation in many areas of education where innovation would not otherwise have been pursued. However, there are serious problems with this type of aid. Some categorical funds are available only for short periods of time, and thus local districts must assume the full cost of the program after the grant lapses. For a variety of reasons, such local assumption is frequently impossible, even for the most successful of programs. Finally, federal definitions of eligibility for such funds are not always realistic. For example, the federal definition of poverty is a $2,000 family income level. Such an inflexible figure disqualifies many children in need of special services.

The Commission, therefore, suggests that federal categorical aid be continued but with more careful monitoring, and more flexible and realistic provisions for eligibility. More importantly, however, the Commission believes that massive infusions of unrestricted general funds should be made available to all districts, particularly to overcome inequities and special cost problems.

Finally, the Commission is concerned that while revenue sharing was originally designed as an indirect means of assisting schools, it has failed to materialize as such. Schools have not been either the direct or the indirect beneficiaries of increased revenue sharing. Federally shared revenues are not specially marked for education; they are returned as general funds to municipal governments, which may or may not have education as a priority, and which certainly do not have major responsibility for education. As a consequence, some school districts have received less federal money directly and have received no additional funds from local revenue sharing, resulting in a net loss. For these reasons, the Commission opposes the use of revenue sharing as a device to assist schools. Instead, the federal government should offer direct grants to school districts and state departments of education to upgrade the quality of educational programs and their administration.

The federal government's role should not impinge directly on the autonomy of local school districts or the ability of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to direct the operation of its schools. Additional sums of money should be forthcoming from the federal government; however, a larger federal role must not subvert the ability of local districts or the Commonwealth to deploy those funds in ways most suitable to

their needs. The proper balance of control between schools, the state Department of Education, and the federal government over the use of such funds can be struck by a combination of general purpose grants and strictly monitored categorical aid programs.

How Schools are Financed in Pennsylvania Today

TABLE X-A

Federal-State-Local Shares of Support of the Public Schools in Pennsylvania

Year	Total	Federal Share*	State Share	Local Share
1963	$1,039,000,000	1.9%	41.6%	56.5%
1968	1,692,000,000	6.7	44.4	48.9
1973 (est.)	2,992,000,000	6.0	48.9	45.1

* Includes both categorical and general funds.

Local Revenue Sources

Between six and 97 per cent of the total monies spent by districts comes from the state.[3] Other portions of district budgets are financed from local taxes and vary according to the amount of state aid. The bulwark of school district tax structures has been and remains the real estate tax. As can be seen in Table X-B, there has been relatively little shifting among local tax sources during the past decade.

TABLE X-B

Local School Taxes as Percent of Total Taxes 1962-63 and 1971-72

	Total	Real Estate	Per Capita (Code)	Act 511*	Special**	Delinquent	Payments in lieu of taxes
1962-63	100%	77.7%	2.7%	13.6%	3.05	2.8%	0.2%
1971-72	100	76.9	1.3	14.2	4.7	2.7	0.2

* The Local Tax Enabling Act, 53 P.S. 6851-6923, 1965, December 31, P.L. 1257.
** Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

The major nonproperty tax source is the earned income or wage tax. The limited capability of school districts to increase non-real estate taxes has caused a search for new sources of revenue for inflationary school budgets.

[3] The latter figure (97%) excludes those payments made directly by the state which by-pass local budgets, for example, the State Employes Retirement Fund, of which the Commonwealth directly pays one-third. See also page 139.

The impact of total local taxes in individual school districts, measured against the market value of taxable real estate in 1970-71, ranged from $34.80 per $1,000 of value down to $2.30 per $1,000. The spread in tax burden is illustrated by the fact that 80 per cent of the districts fall within a range of $28.90 per $1,000 of market value (90th percentile) to $18.80 (10th percentile). These differences in tax burdens reflect the variation in local district expenditure levels, and the state subsidy system's present inability to equalize fully local tax efforts.

State Spending for Public Schools

The state's share of educational funding represents 41 per cent of the entire Commonwealth 1973-74 general fund budget. The Commonwealth's support for public schools is of two types:

1. State subsidy payments of various types are made to local school districts, which, in turn, expend the funds for their programs.

2. Direct state payments are made for certain purposes *on behalf* of school districts, such as payments toward retirement funds for school employes, the operation of the intermediate units and the operations of the Department of Education.

In 1971-72, subsidy payments constituted 92 per cent of the total Commonwealth support ($1.3 billion) for public school education. In order to understand the Commission's recommendations in these areas, it is important to understand how the current susbidy program presently operates.

Subsidy Programs

State subsidy payments to local school districts fall within three[4] general types:

1. *General purpose-equalization grants*

   This is by far the largest subsidy, and supports the general instruction program. It incorporates a formula[5] designed to equalize local tax burdens and adjustment factors which provide additional funds for high levels of poverty, density, or sparsity.

---

[4] In a later section of this chapter, the Commission recommends the creation of a fourth category of subsidies to encourage innovation. See page 152.

[5] See pages 141-143 for a discussion of the equalization formula (aid ratio).

2. *Special purpose-equalization grants*[6]

Subsidies are paid for particular spending purposes which also incorporate the equalization formula. Subsidies of this type include those for homebound instruction, driver education, transportation, debt service, and authority rentals.

3. *Special purpose-flat grants*[7]

Subsidies are paid for special spending purposes which are based on program cost, fixed amount per pupil or some other basis not incorporating an equalization formula. These subsidies include medical and dental services; vocational education; the instruction of migrant children, orphan court-placed children; the physically and mentally handicapped and the gifted; financially distressed districts; and in lieu of tax payments for certain state-owned lands.

General Instruction Subsidy

In order to understand the major thrust of the Commission's fiscal recommendations, it is important to comprehend the method by which the current general instructions subsidy is computed (See Table X-C). The general instructional subsidy computed in 1972-73 amounted to more than $1 billion. For that reason, the Commission has addressed itself primarily to the subsidy formula for basic education.

TABLE X-C

Base Subsidy	$ 837.9 million
Guarantee	4.3
Density	81.5
Sparsity	26.2
Poverty	85.4
Less: Maximum Restriction	1.8*
	$1,033.5 million

* Instructional subsidy may not exceed 90 per cent of instructional expenditures.

[6] In the Supportive Services chapter of this report, the Commission has recommended transportation be fully covered by the state Department of Transportation. The Commission believes that this agency is best suited to provide both safe and efficient transportation operations for the educational systems of the Commonwealth. This transportation network is to be coordinated by the intermediate units for purposes of scheduling and maximum efficiency.

[7] In earlier sections of the chapter on Supportive Services, the Commission has recommended that the entire services for medical and dental operations be taken over by the Department of Health where part of the funds now eminate. In addition, financing of that program should be totally borne by the appropriate community health and state health agencies, instead of coming from instructional funds, which creates a deficit.

The present basic subsidy formula was devised in 1965.

It requires development each year of an aid ratio based upon two factors: the market value of taxable real estate in each school district (measures of wealth) and the number of pupils in membership in each school district (measures of need).

The Commonwealth pays annually an average of 50 per cent of the actual cost of instruction, up to an established statewide average expenditure per pupil (the average fixed by law has been $665.00 beginning with payments for the 1971-72 school year). Two significant subsidy formula factors which directly affect the accuracy and the equitable distribution of funds are the minimum aid ratio of 10 per cent (which results in 17 school districts receiving state aid disproportionate to their relative wealth) and the provision that a maximum subsidy of 90 per cent of the total reimbursable instructional expenditure may be paid (which results in 23 school districts being denied over $1.8 million to which they would otherwise be entitled).

Computation of Aid Ratio

How then is the aid ratio computed? The aid ratio results from comparing the wealth of each school district with the number of pupils to be educated and compares this wealth per pupil with that of every other district in the Commonwealth. The aid ratio adjusts a theoretical average state contribution of 50 per cent share of the cost per pupil (up to a maximum of $665.00), so that poor districts receive more than 50 per cent and wealthy districts receive less.

The market value of taxable real estate property in each school district is determined annually by the State Tax Equalization Board. The number of pupils is determined by the Department of Education from attendance reports filed by each school district, with weightings applied as follows:

Kindergarten—0.5 Elementary—1.0
Secondary—1.36

The number of pupils is then expressed as weighted average daily membership (WADM).

The formula used to compute the aid ratio is as follows:

$$\text{aid ratio} = 1.000 - \frac{\text{(District market value per pupil in WADM)}}{\text{(Statewide market value per pupil in WADM)}} \times .50^{*}$$

* District's per cent share

Additional examples of the computation of the aid ratio are shown in Table X-E, Sections A and B.

TABLE X-E

Computation of Basic Instruction Subsidy for Three Hypothetical School Districts*

A. *Basic Data*

Pupils	Average Daily Membership (ADM)	Weighted Average Daily Membership (WADM)
Kindergarten	400	(.5) 200
Elementary	2500	(1.0) 2500
Secondary	2500	(1.36) 3400
WADM for aid ratio		6100
1972-73 operating expenditures		$4,514,000
Operating expenditures per WADM		$ 740

	Poor District	Average District	Wealthy District
Market Value Taxable Property	$45,750,000	$113,771,100	$155,550,000
Market Value per WADM	$ 7,500	$ 18,651**	$ 25,500

B. *Aid Ratio*

Poor District ..... $1.000 - \left\{ \frac{7,500}{18,651} = .402 \times .50 = .201 \right\} = .799$ aid ratio

Average District .... $1.000 - \left\{ \frac{18,651}{18,651} = 1.000 \times .50 = .50 \right\} = .500$ aid ratio

Wealthy District .... $1.000 - \left\{ \frac{25,500}{18,651} = 1.367 \times .50 = .683 \right\} = .317$ aid ratio

C. *Subsidy*

Poor District ..... $665*** x .799 = $531.33 x 6,100 WADM = $3,241,113
Average District .. $665 x .500 = $332.50 x 6,100 WADM = $2,028,250
Wealthy District .. $665 x .317 = $210.80 x 6,100 WADM = $1,285,880

D. *Taxing Effort*

	Poor District	Average District	Wealthy District
Remaining per pupil cost to be financed by district	$208.67	$407.50	$529.20
Taxes per pupil raised by 1 mill on Market Value	$ 7.50	$ 18.65	$ 25.50
Mills on Market Value to finance			
a. Remainder of $665 maximum	17.8 mills	17.8 mills	17.8 mills
b. $75 per pupil excess cost	10.0 mills	4.0 mills	2.9 mills

* Same size as to pupils and operating expenditures but different levels of wealth.

** Statewide average market value per WADM for 1972-73.

*** Maximum reimbursable cost per pupil WADM.

To compute a school district's base subsidy, it is necessary to multiply its aid ratio by the lesser of either the actual cost per pupil or $665.00. This yields the subsidy *per pupil*, which is in turn multiplied by the number of pupils in Weighted Average Daily Membership (WADM) (See Table X-E, Section C). As designed, the subsidy is intended to provide more funds to poor districts than to rich districts (See Table X-E, Section D).

In addition to the basic subsidy, the state provides districts with funds to meet additional costs due to several special factors, such as exceptionally dense or exceptionally sparse population. The General Assembly has also recognized that districts with large concentrations of poor children have unusually high costs. Therefore, it has provided a poverty factor under which every school district may qualify for additional subsidy based on the actual and proportionate numbers of poor children.

Other Subsidies

Reference has been made to subsidies other than the basic instructional subsidy. The Table X-F shows the estimated amounts for such other subsidies as provided by the Commonwealth in fiscal year 1972-73.

TABLE X-F

Debt Service	$105.7 million
Special Education	90.1
Transportation	50.8
Vocational Education	22.5
Health Services	14.5
Tuition	6.8
Driver Training	4.2
Homebound Instruction	.6
Distressed Districts	1.0

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Real Estate Tax Assessments

One of the grave difficulties inherent in the subsidy system which has brought it under such attack in recent days has been the unequal tax assessment process operating among local government units across the Commonwealth. There are wide disparities in the methods by which market value is determined from district to district.

These disparities have fueled taxpayer unrest. Because of differing millage rates, it appears that taxes are much higher in some districts

than in others. Appearances can be deceiving, however, for the assessment bases may be extremely different, which may account for the differential in millage levied. An example of this is found in a comparison of Philadelphia or Pittsburgh with the suburban counties adjacent to them. In the cities, the assessed base is usually a very high percentage of market value but the millage imposed is relatively low. In the suburbs, the assessed value is usually a very low percentage of market value, but the millage imposed is rather high. A consequence of this is that many suburbanites wrongly believe that the cities are levying a much lower tax. In fact, if the assessed bases were brought up to par, in many instances the city taxes would be as high or higher. Moreover, substantial differences in taxes may not be related to educational spending. Municipal overburden[8] may account for such discrepancies. The state subsidy system was not designed to address this problem. Nor does the Commission believe that such a complex issue can be resolved simply by adjusting the educational subsidy formula.

The Commission does believe that there are serious inequities preserved in the tax assessment process which distort the subsidy system. In order to alleviate these inequities, the Commission has studied the present assessment system and has examined the abilities of the State Tax Equalization Board to deal properly with these inherent difficulties. The real estate taxes levied by a school district are based on an assessed valuation which is an arbitrary percentage of the market value as determined by the county-operated assessment program. The system, as previously noted, has resulted in serious inequities. Competent assessors are lacking, and there is a general absence of modern and efficient assessment systems resulting in wide disparities in assessments.

The Commission believes that the real estate tax—the major source of local revenue support for public education in Pennsylvania—is a source of serious tax inequities. These result from the regressive nature of the tax itself, and, more importantly, from the manner in which the tax has been administered. A more efficiently and uniformly administered real estate tax would be fairer and a more productive source of revenue. The Commission believes that these administrative deficiencies are correctible, and that the real estate tax is far too significant a revenue source to be discarded at this time.

To accommodate a more uniform and equitable real estate tax system in the Commonwealth for all school districts, the Commission recommends that:

---

[8] Municipal overburden is the term used to describe the higher costs of providing public services other than education in urban areas with the resultant excessive strain on local tax resources.

10-1.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD AMEND THE APPLICABLE ASSESSMENT LAWS TO REQUIRE THAT:

10-1.1 REAL ESTATE BE ASSESSED FOR TAX PURPOSES UNIFORMLY AT FULL MARKET VALUE.

10-1.2 ASSESSMENTS BE KEPT UP-TO-DATE ON A CONTINUING BASIS, RECOGNIZING AND INCORPORATING IMPROVEMENTS TO PROPERTY AND CHANGES IN LAND VALUE AND APPLYING THE MOST ADVANCED COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY TOWARD THIS END; AND, THAT REAPPRAISALS BE MADE AT LEAST EVERY THREE YEARS.

10-2.0 THE STATE SHOULD BEGIN AND MAINTAIN CLOSE SUPERVISION OVER COUNTY ASSESSMENT ADMINISTRATION IN THE FOLLOWING RESPECTS:

10-2.1 MANDATORY ASSESSOR TRAINING COURSES SHOULD BE PROVIDED, AND ASSESSORS SHOULD BE CERTIFIED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS.

10-2.2 THE APPOINTMENT OF ASSESSORS SHOULD BE BASED ON CERTIFICATION, AND RETENTION IN SUCH POSITIONS SHOULD BE BASED ON MERITORIOUS PERFORMANCE.

10-2.3 A NEW INDEPENDENT STATE AGENCY TO MONITOR THE ADEQUACY OF MAP AND RECORD SYSTEMS SHOULD BE EMPOWERED TO ORDER THE ADJUSTMENT OF VALUATIONS OR FULL REAPPRAISALS WHEN ASSESSMENTS FAIL TO ADHERE TO STANDARDS OF UNIFORMITY OR FULL MARKET VALUE.

The Commission notes the present legislative proposals for a uniform assessment law which would implement most of the above recommendations, particularly those recommendations for training and certification of assessors and for state supervision of assessment administration. The bills introduced in 1973 are not, however, in agreement on the question of assessment ratios, and the Commission strongly reaffirms its belief and recommendation that *full market value* is the most desirable standard.

Cost Basis for Subsidy

The present aid ratio formula relates the taxable per pupil wealth in each school district to the average per pupil wealth statewide. When this is applied to a reimbursable base reflective of actual cost, sufficient state funds are made available to provide, when coupled with the local share, an equal educational opportunity as measured in dollars, at approximately the same rate of local taxation in each district. However, when the actual cost rises above the maximum reimbursable base, all cost above the base must be borne locally. Thus, a district's ability to spend above that level is related to its wealth. The funds available for a student's education, therefore, are a function of the wealth of his parents and neighbors and their willingness to tax themselves for educational purposes.

This problem may be illustrated by referring to hypothetical districts used in the previous table, X-E. If the per pupil cost in each district amounted to $740.00 ($75.00 above the $665.00 maximum reimbursable base), the taxing effort required to finance the unsubsidized portion of that cost would be as follows (measured per $1,000 market value of taxable real estate):

Average district—$ 4.02
Poor district —$10.00
Wealthy district—$ 2.94

The reimbursable base (that is, maximum reimbursable cost) becomes inadequate when any of the following conditions occur:

a. when, in a period of rising costs, payment is based upon the previous year's cost.
b. when the base is fixed by law and falls below actual cost levels due to the failure to amend regularly.
c. when the base is an average of the widely varying costs of all school districts. Thus, school districts containing approximately half of all pupils will always be incurring nonreimbursable expenses in excess of the average.

The instructional subsidy is paid on a reimbursement basis, that is, for costs incurred during the *previous* year. This delayed reimbursement procedure causes districts not to receive funds for increased enrollments and/or costs until a year after such costs are incurred. The absence of *current* funding has a tendency to discourage the starting of new programs because of insufficient cash flow. To alleviate this problem, the Commission recommends that:

10-3.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD AMEND THE INSTRUCTIONAL SUBSIDY SO THAT THE SUBSIDY WILL BE BASED UPON THE EXPENDITURE LEVEL AND THE PUPILS IN MEMBERSHIP FOR THE YEAR IN WHICH IT IS MADE. FOR THE FIRST YEAR *ONLY*, A DISTRICT WHICH WOULD RECEIVE A LESSER SUBSIDY ON A CURRENT FUNDING BASIS SHOULD RECEIVE ITS SUBSIDY ON THE BASIS OF THE PRIOR YEAR'S ENTITLEMENT.

Some specific program ought to be devised for those districts which, as a result of transferring to current funding might enjoy a sudden windfall of new unexpected funds. Such funds might be earmarked for reduction of debt service, for adoption of specific new programs or for the acquisition of specific kinds of instructional equipment.

* * *

The cost basis for the instructional subsidy, rather than being fixed permanently in the law as at present, should be more flexible. It should be established on an annual basis by the Department of Education at a figure statistically computed to be the anticipated cost of a quality pro-

gram for the coming year.[9] This cost basis should be submitted to the General Assembly, together with the annual request for funds for subsidies to local districts, based upon such costs. The following recommendation, if adopted, would relieve the current problem which occurs when districts spend above the statutorily fixed base and are thereby forced to bear a greater portion of the support of education on a local basis. In addition, it would substitute a base representing a projected cost of a quality program in place of an average statewide cost for the previous year. Therefore:

10-4.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A REALISTIC COST BASIS FOR THE BASIC SUBSIDY, THE LEVEL TO BE RECOMMENDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AS A FACTOR IN ITS ANNUAL BUDGET REQUEST, REFLECTING THE COST OF A QUALITY EDUCATION ON A PER PUPIL BASIS IN THE COMMONWEALTH.

In the Organization for Instruction chapter of this report, the Commission recommends that gradedness no longer be mandated in Pennsylvania schools. Since reimbursement is now based in part on grade designations, a change to nongradedness would have to be accompanied by a more flexible method for calculating subsidy, *i.e.*, one *not* tied to grade levels. This would have the enormous educational benefit of relating the allocation of resources to the actual cost of programs in which children are engaged and would eliminate the current funding bias against the early years of schooling.

* * *

Pennsylvania is a state of great diversity—in income levels, economic wealth, cost of living, population density, and availability of local tax resources for school purposes. These factors hamper efforts to achieve equitable distribution of state funds for school purposes. Currently, sparsity payments attempt to meet the added costs of rural areas. Conversely, density and excessive density payments are a device to attempt to meet the added costs of urban and related suburban areas and the reduced amount of funds available for school purposes in those metropolitan communities. Payment for these purposes is arbitrarily computed, because the computation does not use actual data to support the relationship of the funds expended to the actual cost incurred locally.

To provide the necessary funds for both the sparsely as well as the densely populated areas of the Commonwealth, and to meet adequately the true costs which emerge as a result of these population conditions, the Commission recommends that:

[9] A quality program is that school district program which demonstrates achievement of the Ten Goals of Quality Education as measured by Educational Quality Assessment (EQA) or some similar process. See Curriculum chapter, page 22.

10-5.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD PROVIDE, IN ADDITION TO THE PAYMENTS PROVIDED UNDER THE SUBSIDY FORMULA, ADDITIONAL PAYMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF SPARSITY, DENSITY, EXCESSIVE DENSITY AND COST OF LIVING. THE ADDITIONAL COST OF SUCH NON-NORMAL FACTORS SHOULD BE ACTUALLY DETERMINED.

A cost of living factor is a separate issue from the questions of poverty, density and sparsity.

The Commission has specifically added cost of living as an appropriate non-normal factor. Since the cost of living varies from one section of the state to another, this factor should be treated as a separate item. It can be readily computed by reference to the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics and other U. S. Commerce Department reports.

* * *

The present formula provides local districts with additional sums of money for each "poverty" pupil and progressively greater amounts as the concentration of poverty increases. However, there is no provision in the present law that requires such funds to be applied specifically to programs to help the poverty children, who are the reason for this fund, overcome the conditions resulting from this poverty. Moreover, recent indications are that the number of children who are truly "poor" is not well determined by the present formula. Poverty children are defined currently as those aged 5 to 17, from families with incomes under $2,000, or from families over that level who are receiving aid to families of dependent children (AFDC). AFDC information is up to date, but low income information is still related to the Federal census, which quickly becomes dated . The 1970 census data is just now being used.

More important, however, is the fact that the definition of poverty itself is so restricted that many, many families whose children suffer from the chronic problems which result from poverty have incomes in excess of the legal level. Nevertheless, their children are in need of the same special attention as children in the families covered by the specifically defined income levels. The Commission, therefore, recommends that:

10-6.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD HOLD SCHOOL DISTRICTS ACCOUNTABLE FOR THE SPENDING FOR APPROPRIATE PURPOSES OF SUBSIDY FUNDS RECEIVED ON ACCOUNT OF POVERTY. THE METHOD OF ARRIVING AT THE NUMBER OF POVERTY CHILDREN IN THE VARIOUS DISTRICTS SHOULD BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED IN THE LAW IN ACCORDANCE WITH CURRENT NEEDS.

To identify poverty children more adequately and to document the costs of special programs which they may require, the Department of Education should develop more appropriate standards for determining poverty and monitor carefully and recommend the programs that are to benefit such children.

Equalization of Local Taxing Effort

Although the instructional subsidy using its aid ratio is essentially well designed for the purpose of equalizing local taxing burdens, there exist in the formula several factors which, directly or indirectly, restrain the subsidy from reaching the goal of maximum equalization. These inequities, and other challenges concerning the equitable distribution of the tax dollar to provide equal educational opportunity throughout the Commonwealth, caused this Commission to ponder long and hard on solutions. The searching questions of the desirability of having full state financing of public education versus retention of the present system with some significant modification received major consideration. While the Commission studied and considered numerous aspects of school finance, including the amount and manner of state financial assistance, local revenue resources and the implications of present and future federal aid programs, the basic financial issue which confronted the Commission was whether to recommend that the Commonwealth assume full funding responsibility for elementary-secondary education or whether to continue with the present system.

The debate over full state funding of public school education has been national in scope, fueled largely by the *Serrano vs. Priest* (California) and *Rodriguez vs. San Antonio* (Texas) court decisions which rejected school financing systems based too narrowly on local real estate taxes. The attack in both cases was not against the real estate tax *per se*, but against undue reliance on local revenue resources where extreme variations existed in local district taxable wealth which had a direct bearing on the quality of the children's education.

Despite the fact that the U. S. Supreme Court reversed the original *Rodriguez* decision, thereby reducing for the present the *national* pressure to revise state support systems for education, the New Jersey Supreme Court, shortly thereafter, found unconstitutional the New Jersey system of support of education.[10] That court interpreted language in the New Jersey Constitution which closely resembles that in the Pennsylvania Constitution on the same subject. Thus, despite the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States has temporarily closed the federal avenue of recourse, the debate on the proper system of financing education as a function of state government continues to rage. This debate filled much of the Commission's concern in the resolution of its position regarding finance. There was significant interest in revising in a drastic way the entire financing structure of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with or without the imperatives of a court decision.

---

[10] *Robinson* v. *Cahill.* New Jersey, 1973.

However, much consideration was given to the fact that the Pennsylvania subsidy system has for some years been recognized by national experts as far superior to those in most other states in its support of public schools and most importantly in its equalization impact on local school tax burdens. In 1970, Dr. J. Alan Thomas of the University of Chicago reported to the Pennsylvania State Board of Education that ". . . the state of Pennsylvania appears to have one of the most consistent, most thoughtful and most effective support systems in the nation."[11] Furthermore, the Commission believes this system to be clearly capable of farther improvements toward the goal of a financial base that can provide equal educational opportunity for each child while retaining the benefits of local administration of the system.

However, the Commission believes that the question of full state funding may have significant benefits and therefore is far too important to be pushed aside and excluded for consideration for an indefinite period. The Commission, therefore, recommends that:

10-7.0 THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD IMMEDIATELY UNDERTAKE A STUDY OF ALL THE RAMIFICATIONS OF THE FULL STATE FUNDING OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY-SECONDARY EDUCATION AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS THEREON TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

Despite the fact that the Commission disposed of the issue of full state financing in this manner, the major recommendations in this chapter up to this point and those which follow are designed to bring the current subsidy formula into as great a compliance as possible with the basic thrust of the two court decisions which have been so much discussed. It is, therefore, believed that if the Commission's recommendations are adopted, they will make the Pennsylvania subsidy system one of the finest in the country with the least possibility of being challenged effectively under court suits involving the equal protection clause of the U. S. Constitution or by virtue of the Pennsylvania constitutional mandate for providing a "thorough and efficient system of public education."

The significant changes concerning the real estate tax assessments and the flexible cost basis of the subsidy have already been described. The following sections of this report will deal with the elimination of the artificial restraints on the ability of the formula to provide true equalization and describing a new incentive-type subsidy designed to increase the quality of education.

Earlier in this chapter, it was mentioned that 17 school districts benefit disproportionately from the provision in the subsidy law that no school district shall receive a subsidy lower than the lesser of 10 per

[11] "Financing Public School Education in Pennsylvania", an Appendix to the 1970 subsidy study of the State Board of Education in Pennsylvania, *Financing Public School Education, 1970 Subsidy Study of the State Board of Education in Pennsylvania.*

cent of instructional cost or $66.50 per pupil. The total amount of subsidy now paid to these school districts because of this provision is $3.9 million. This does not indicate the total amount of overpayment, or the amount paid by raising the school district's actual computed aid ratio to 10 per cent.

It is the Commission's judgment that the retention of the minimum subsidy builds into the subsidy system an inequity which by its very nature benefits those districts who are, in fact, most able to support their instructional program without state aid.

The Commission further sees inequity in the provision that no school district shall be paid instructional subsidies in excess of 90 per cent of its instructional expenditure. The 23 school districts affected by this limitation are among those which can least afford loss of state subsidy. Of the total of $1.8 million involved, losses to individual school districts range as high as $573,000, a considerable sum for a school district in one of the Commonwealth's economically depressed areas.

With each change in the state subsidy system, it has been the practice to guarantee that no school district shall receive less in subsidies than it did before the change was enacted. This happened with the last major change in 1965, when the present aid ratio formula was adopted. In 1971-72 seven years later, 19 school districts continued to benefit from that so-called "grandfather clause," the total state payment being $1,334,679. Act 373 of 1972 updated the guarantee to the 1970-71 subsidy level for the reported particular benefit of some newly reorganized districts. As a result, in 1972-73, the number of benefited districts increased to 64 and the total state payment rose to $4,285,452. Payments to individual districts range up to $400,000. As with the minimum subsidy, it is those districts who least need the extra help that are actually receiving it.

Because time has elapsed since any of these districts would have been financially hit by sudden changes in their subsidy, the Commission believes that it is no longer appropriate to provide the guarantee or the "grandfather clause." In order to do away with the artificial restraints on the equalization goal of the subsidy formula, the following changes are recommended:

10-8.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD AMEND THE SUBSIDY FORMULA TO ELIMINATE THE 10 PER CENT MINIMUM SUBSIDY FROM THE LAW.

10-9.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD AMEND THE SUBSIDY FORMULA TO REMOVE THE 90 PER CENT MAXIMUM INSTRUCTIONAL SUBSIDY AND TO INCREASE IT TO 100 PER CENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL EXPENDITURES.

10-10.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD ABOLISH FROM THE LAW THE "GRANDFATHER CLAUSE" GUARANTEEING ANY PREVIOUS YEAR'S LEVEL OF SUBSIDIES.

The year's overlap provided by Recommendation 10-3.0[12] is not a "grandfather's clause." Since funding is now delayed a year, the year's grace suggested in that recommendation is, in fact, merely payment of funds to which districts are legally entitled.

* * *

The Commission questions the use of the market value of taxable real estate as the only measure of wealth in computing the aid ratio. The known shortcomings of the process are compounded by the fact that personal wealth increasingly is evidenced in ways other than the holdings of real estate. Although in the past the unavailability of data made the use of personal income as a measure of wealth unfeasible, the Pennsylvania state personal income tax now provides a basis for determining relative personal income by school district.

In order to make available a proper data base to consider the implications of using some combination of real property and income as a basis for state aid to education on local district basis, the Commission recommends:

10-11.0 THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SHOULD SEEK INFORMATION FROM THE STATE PERSONAL INCOME TAX ADMINISTRATION THAT WOULD PERMIT CONSIDERATION OF INCLUDING INCOME AS AN ADDITIONAL FACTOR TO PROPERTY VALUE AS A MEASURE OF WEALTH IN COMPUTING THE AID RATIO.

Incentive Subsidies

The system of state school subsidies not only should provide adequate financial support for the ongoing programs of local school districts, but it should be flexible enough to encourage creativity in seeking solutions to educational problems.

As a result of studies and deliberations in the areas of instruction and management,[13] the Commission is convinced of the need for planning, research and testing of innovative programs in all areas of public school education. It further believes that the major part of such efforts can be carried out most effectively by the local school districts.

It is important that local study and experimentation not be limited to wealthy districts—particularly since problems tend to occur in districts of moderate or below average wealth, which are likely to have difficulty finding sufficient funds to engage in extensive creative and innovative programming.

It is the Commission's opinion that the Department of Education has a special role in this regard, by virtue of its diagnostic and evaluative capabilities and functions and its ability to offer both financial and

[12] See page 146.

[13] See Chapter V on Organization for Instruction and Chapter VII on Management.

technical assistance and incentives to local districts. In order to facilitate proper innovation in all districts, irrespective of their local wealth base, the Commission recommends that:

10-12.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD PROVIDE A SPECIAL STATE SUBSIDY TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TO ENCOURAGE SCHOOL DISTRICTS, INDIVIDUALLY OR BY GROUPS OR REGIONS, TO UNDERTAKE INNOVATIVE AND DEVELOPMENTAL PROGRAMS IN SUCH AREAS AS CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTION, ADMINISTRATION OR COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT.

Such funds should be for temporary extra salaries, in-service training, experimental instructional materials, consultants and project evaluations. Funds should not be used to build physical facilities or to expand staff. Projects usually should be supported for no more than three years.

Funds should be used to increase the general wealth of knowledge in the field rather than simply to aggrandize an individual district by the possession of a special program. Successful programs should be publicized throughout the Commonwealth to encourage their incorporation into the fundamental program funded through the state subsidy.

The Collective Bargaining Process and its Impact on School Districts

Act 195, the Public Employees Relation Act of 1970, has significantly altered relationships between school boards and their employes. The public has also assumed a new attitude toward the teachers and other professional employes in the district and their role in the school system. Both professional and, in many districts, nonprofessional employes have organized into collective bargaining units. Since 1970, there have been 150 public school strikes in Pennsylvania.

The unpreparedness of many local school boards in combination with the preparation and militance of local teacher organizations to deal with the phenomenon has meant the loss of many hours of school for many school children throughout the Commonwealth. Another result of the act has been the breaking of heretofore cooperative working relationship in many school districts.

It is the Commission's view that the disruptions of the last several years have been the result, not of the right to bargain, but of unfamiliarity with the Act and with the process of collective bargaining in general. The basic difficulties which the Commission notes are those which would result from any new act which has not yet had an opportunity to work itself through the system. Nevertheless, some problems must be confronted.

One of the most important is the insufficiency of Pennsylvania Labor Relations Board (PLRB) staff. Act 195 increased the number of people with whom the PLRB must work by over 250,000—without significantly increasing its actual staff. Moreover, because employment in school districts is considerably different from employment in industry, school negotiations require a specialized PLRB staff to facilitate negotiations and forestall impasse and unneces-ary strikes. The absence of such skills has been partly responsible for the failure of impasse procedures as defined in Act 195 to be fully implemented. The Commission, therefore, recommends that:

10-13.0 THE PENNSYLVANIA LABOR RELATIONS BOARD AND THE COURTS SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO SEE THAT ALL OF THE IMPASSE PROCEDURES OF ACT 195 ARE FULLY EXHAUSTED BEFORE THE "LIMITED RIGHT TO STRIKE" IS EXERCISED BY TEACHER ASSOCIATIONS.

A further recommendation to provide an ongoing monitoring of the impact of Act 195 on the educational process in the Commonwealth is made by the Commission. While the Commission believes it is too soon to suggest major revisions of Act 195, the Commission foresees that, over time, some revisions might be warranted. In order to provide a proper mechanism for review and evaluation, the Commission recommends that:

10-14.0 THERE SHOULD BE PERIODIC EVALUATIONS OF THE IMPACT OF ACT 195 ON THE QUALITY OF EDUCATION IN THE COMMONWEALTH. AN AD HOC COMMISSION OR LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED AT THE STATE LEVEL TO ACCOMPLISH THIS PURPOSE.

In deliberations concerning Act 195, the Commission was particularly disturbed by the incidence of strikes which it had witnessed in the course of the Commission's existence. One of the major dilemmas confronting the Commission was the fact that under the present state subsidy law, there is a mandatory loss of subsidy for districts that are forced to close down because of a strike, thereby penalizing both district and students. However, because most teachers are employed for less than 12 months per year, they may not necessarily suffer economic penalty if they strike for a short period of time since the district must provide (if it can) 180 days of instruction and many teachers' contracts call for simply 180 days of instruction. The Commission believes that this lack of economic sanction may encourage some teachers to strike over issues which perhaps would not have resulted in strikes if there had been a direct economic penalty incident to the teacher exercising the right to strike.

In a recent opinion by the Pennsylvania Attorney General, the present double penalty suffered by school districts as a result of loss of 180

days of instruction has been reduced to a single year's penalty.[14] In view of this, the Commission believes that an appropriate corollary to the subsidy penalty on the school district would be a mandatory salary penalty on the school teacher who exercises the right to strike. Therefore, the Commission recommends that:

10-15.0 IN THE EVENT OF A STRIKE, TEACHERS SHOULD LOSE A FULL DAY'S REMUNERATION FOR EVERY DAY STRUCK AND SHOULD BE COMPENSATED ONLY FOR SUCH ADDITIONAL DAYS AS THE CALENDAR OF THAT PARTICULAR SCHOOL DISTRICT PERMITS. A DAY'S REMUNERATION SHOULD BE DETERMINED BY DIVIDING THE EMPLOYE'S ANNUAL SALARY BY THE ACTUAL NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL DAYS. DISTRICTS WHERE STRIKES OCCUR SHOULD LOSE ONE DAY'S SUBSIDY FOR EACH DAY'S INSTRUCTION NOT PROVIDED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SCHOOL CODE.

* * *

The Commission discussed at length the prospect of employes who violate the limited right to strike by illegal strikes and who, thereafter, defy court orders. Such gross violations of the court's order are inconsistent with the role of the teacher in setting a proper conduct model for students. Therefore, the Commission recommends that:

10-16.0 ANY EMPLOYE WHO PARTICIPATES IN AN ILLEGAL STRIKE OR WHO DEFIES A COURT ORDER SHOULD BE SUBJECT TO DISMISSAL.

Employes who participate in illegal strikes should be subject to dismissal; however, such employes should not be dismissed arbitrarily or automatically. There is great difficulty in determining what constitutes "participation" in an illegal strike and at what point the strike becomes illegal. To avoid the arbitrary and mandatory quality of automatic dismissal, the Commission has, therefore, recommended that participation, as defined by some future legislative act, would be *grounds* for dismissal but would not necessarily result in automatic dismissal.

* * *

It should be noted that the preceding discussion of Act 195 is a reflection of the Commission's belief that the School Code in many ways constitutes the minimum labor agreement between the districts and the professional employes in the system. Since the definition of the school year makes teachers unique in terms of the length of their contract and their employment status, it seemed appropriate to the Commission to make recommendations to revise the School Code rather than to remedy the labor management situation by reference to Act 195 itself. There are no guarantees that any of these recommendations will reduce the incidence of strikes in school districts. However, with the requirement referred to in the Management chapter of this report advocating in-

[14] Informal opinion of Deputy Attorney General, June 22, 1973.

creased knowledge and skill by management administrative teams in the collective bargaining process and familiarity with Act 195 itself,[15] there ought to be increased, meaningful deliberations and negotiations engaged in by both parties to the benefit of the school system without undue dislocation. The Commission's recommendations have been put forth as an attempt to deal with several of the most specific examples of dislocation which have resulted in the implementation of Act 195 in the first three years of its operation.

* * *

One of the problems brought to the attention of this Commission during its several rounds of public hearings was the lack of reciprocal agreements among states for the operation of retirement systems for educators.

The absence of such agreements reduces the opportunity for educators to enter or to leave the Commonwealth's school system. Lack of reciprocity makes it a financial hardship for educators to cross state lines to seek employment. The Commission believes it is desirable and beneficial to both individuals and school districts to enlarge the market for employment across state lines. Reciprocity agreements will increase the pool of talent available to the school districts of the Commonwealth. The recruitment of out-of-state educators could result in the influx of leaders with fresh insight into existing educational problems. Therefore:

10-17.0 THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY SHOULD ESTABLISH RECIPROCAL AGREEMENTS WITH OTHER STATES CONCERNING THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOL EMPLOYES RETIREMENT SYSTEM SO THAT BENEFITS COULD FOLLOW THE EMPLOYE FROM STATE TO STATE.

General Concerns

The Commission has not made specific recommendations on several matters which have financial impact. However, implied throughout this report is the need for a strong Department of Education staff to assist local districts in implementing the many new directives and new techniques which are recommended in this report. This will not occur unless the Department of Education itself is adequately financed and appropriately staffed. Large organizations tend to become lethargic unless there are incentive opportunities for both creative as well as status promotions. Serious consideration should be given by the General Assembly, the Department, and the State Board of Education to upgrade Department staff. One approach might be to use merit pay.

[15] See Management chapter, pp. 81-82.

Another might be to establish a staff exchange program to increase the prestige associated with service in the state Department of Education and to assure that professionals in the Department do not lose touch with activities in the schools. Under this program, professionals in the Department of Education, school districts, intermediate units, and teacher preparing institutions should be able to exchange positions for up to 18 months, subject to necessary regulations to assure program continuity, without loss of tenure, salary, or retirement benefits. Funds to cover relocation costs for the period of the exchange should also be provided.

* * *

There has been considerable discussion throughout the earlier chapters of this report of the need to meet the individual needs of the children and to provide flexible and personalized systems of instruction. The Commission recognizes the need for actual alternative schools to exist within the public school framework. It is essential for the creation of truly innovative and flexible, personalized modes of instruction that full systems or mini-systems be permitted to be created within the public school framework in order to give an opportunity for these ideas to flourish and to be examined under close scrutiny. There should be a clear understanding by the public that the Commission believes that alternatives may be constructed in many different ways and that alternatives may be deemed both traditional and nontraditional in order to meet the test of "alternative education." The financing scheme as recommended by this chapter should be capable of providing flexible methods of financing programs whether by class, by school building, by districts or by regions depending upon the type of program envisioned. This, therefore, should provide incentive programs for more than simply a special program, but should conceivably embrace the concept of an innovative school within the public school system.

* * *

In recent years, there has been increasing concern about the need for public school systems to ensure against casualty, theft, fire and other major disasters. In the last year, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court has lifted strict, sovereign or governmental immunity from the public school systems of the state. As a result, the Management chapter of this report has addressed itself to the problem of financing the newly defined liability through appropriate insurance policies in consultation with the state insurance commissioner. No recommendation has been made with the respect to the method of financing such premiums. This problem should be addressed at once.

Conclusion

The Commission believes that its recommendations concerning finance would result in a significant increase in the level of state funding for elementary-secondary education, an increase directed toward the school districts that need it most. It further believes that the real estate tax would be made both more productive and more equitable as the major local revenue support for public education.

The subsidy system, with proposed changes, could channel sufficient funds to all districts to provide a quality program. It would have the capability to adapt to the greater flexibility of programs recommended elsewhere by this Commission by allowing for innovation and for additional spending of local funds where such is deemed desirable. It would also recognize local control and the restraint on spending by local authority when it relates to the necessity to levy taxes at that level.

The present equalization formula—if allowed to function as intended, without artificial restraint, if its components are kept up-to-date and accurate, and if it is adequately funded—should equalize the state and local funds available. It would thereby provide an equal educational opportunity for every child in Pennsylvania at an approximately equal local tax effort regardless of the wealth of the district in which he resides. This revised system answers the objections to the California and Texas systems raised in the *Serrano* and *Rodriguez* cases, that the taxable wealth of the local districts made the quality of children's education a function of the level of that wealth. The other recommendations will significantly enhance the equity of tax burden now borne by taxpayers in unequal manner across the Commonwealth.

In large part, the successful implementation of the recommendations contained in this report depend upon the adoption of improved financing mechanisms.

APPENDIX—MINORITY REPORTS

Chapter III—Commission Perspective

Nonpublic Schools

The failure of the Commission to respond, in any substantive way, to the needs of all the children in the Commonwealth is the reason for this minority report. It is a fundamental failure that distorts the Governor's charge to this Commission—a charge to "find ways to make education more responsive to the needs of its consumers—the children, parents, and communities of the Commonwealth."

The Commission has acted wisely to aid children in public schools, but it has ignored the needs of nonpublic school children and the variety of ways available to help such children. In so doing, the Commission has shown both a narrowness of educational vision and a lack of creative imagination. It has taken a step backward towards a rigidity that seeks to narrow rather than expand educational benefits. Further, the Commission has contradicted the public policy of the Commonwealth and the nation—a policy developed democratically and imaginatively through widespread discussion and debate over a number of years.

It is no argument to say that there are constitutional prohibitions against such aid. The United States Supreme Court has already declared in *Lemon v. Kurtzman* that: "our decisions have permitted the states to provide church-related schools with secular, neutral or nonideological services, facilities or materials." In the Allen case, the Supreme Court specifically permitted the loan of textbooks to nonpublic school children.

Since 1965, the nation, through the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, has enriched the education of children everywhere, especially the children of the poor. Our own Pennsylvania legislature passed (the Senate by unanimous vote) and our Governor approved a creative, imaginative approach to aiding children in nonpublic schools through the provision of non-ideological services, equipment, and textbooks. Thus both nationally and on a state level, an enlightened public policy has been established—a policy which, while rightfully stressing the central role of the public schools, seeks to aid, within constitutional limits, all children in all schools.

But this Commission renounces such a policy and substitutes a narrow vision that excludes some children from possible educational benefits simply because they do not attend public schools. Such a rigid stance runs counter to the flexibility, the variety and the creative ap-

proaches that the Commission advocates so strongly. It is strange and terribly sad that a Commission, which speaks out boldly about the desirability of imaginative, alternative programs, becomes absolutist and doctrinaire in refusing even to explore constitutional ways to extend benefits to all children.

The Commission's extreme stance against any form of educational aid to nonpublic school children would in practice allow only the affluent freedom of choice in education. The children of the poor would have no means to secure the education that their religious convictions demand.

Finally, the Commission's commendable concern to unite and involve the total community in the educational effort is, to a substantial degree, vitiated by its failure to be concerned about all the community's children. Instead of merely preaching about the duty of all to support the public schools, the Commission could have manifested a concern for all children that would have far more effectively united the community in support of the public schools. Sadly, the Commission has not learned that communities are brought together, not by denying benefits to some children, but by trying to help all children.

Hopefully, the community will be wiser than the Commission: hopefully, it will unite solidly in support of the public schools, while constantly and creatively seeking constitutional means to help all children.

Signed:
Edward T. Hughes

Concurring:
Donald W. Fox
James J. A. Gallagher
Max Homer
Hugh F. McKeegan

Chapter V—Organization for Instruction

Recommendation #5-5.0

Recommendation: All existing Pennsylvania School Code provisions, Department of Education regulations and guidelines which mandate gradedness or create constraints which may hinder the operation of flexible and personalized educational programs should be eliminated.

Objection: The spirit of the recommendation is supported. However, a good graded system *may* be superior to an a-theoretical ungraded system with no or poorly derived criteria for assessing student progress. Further, the immediate elimination of code provisions, regulations and guidelines regarding gradedness without specifying other standards in their place could result in chaotic conditions in many schools.

Additional Recommendation: Every school system must develop a rationale to support its particular variation of flexible and personalized educational programs together with curricular sequences and criteria for assessing pupil progress.

Signed:

Hugh F. McKeegan

Concurring:

Paul S. Christman
Donald W. Fox
Joseph M. Plevyak
William Potter

Educational Technology

The Commission, while it adopted a sophisticated definition of technology, made no specific recommendations regarding the better use of educational technology in schools. In view of the possible interaction between collective bargaining and technology, specific recommendations in this area are of a very high priority.

Schools are labor intensive kinds of enterprises. They employ large numbers of highly trained professionals, and depend largely on human effort and human interactions to achieve their purposes. The introduction of collective bargaining into labor intensive enterprises in other sectors of our society has resulted in drastic and rather sudden shifts to techniques that depend largely on machine rather than human effort. This may not happen in education, but the danger is that in the economic strains created by collective bargaining in an inflationary economy, schools will turn too quickly to inadequate or inappropriate

machine technologies. This would only result in further dehumanization of our schools, alienation of both students and teachers, and further disenchantment with educational processes. There may not be much time left to define policy to guide the development of technologies appropriate for schools. That schools are using and will use technologies of various sorts is certain; the nature, purpose and scope of future use remains to be defined. The minds of children are too precious to leave this definition solely to chance, the whims of the market place, or the give-and-take of the bargaining table. Policies for the appropriate use of educational technology must be a priority item at all levels of education. Therefore, it is recommended that:

a. Scientific findings from research on human learning, instruction and human development as a basis for an acceptable educational technology be emphasized in both preservice and inservice teacher education.

b. A moratorium be declared on the introduction of machine technologies borrowed from the military and business until each district has established policies and priorities for educational technologies appropriate to the school as a human and humane enterprise.

c. The State Board of Education commission a study of the adequacy of current Pennsylvania Department of Education policies, procedures and guidelines for the use of technology with the view of coordinating these policies, procedures and guidelines with the definition of technology and its place in instruction advocated by the Citizens Commission.

Signed:
Hugh F. McKeegan

Chapter VI—Staffing

Recommendations #6-4.0, 6-4.1 and 6-4.2

Recommendations: In its standards for certification of professional school personnel, the Department of Education should require that prospective teachers undergo a system of rigorous clinical experience which would take one of two forms.

There should be college or university sponsored internships for prospective teachers who are pursuing an approved education program throughout their undergraduate careers. These internships would take place in selected school districts or teacher centers and would be for one school year.

Selected school districts, intermediate units or teacher centers that develop approved programs should sponsor an alternative type of internship. This would be for people who wish to enter teaching and possess a degree other than from an approved program and who have had no previous training. This internship would be for a minimum of two years. In order for such a program to be approved, it must, in the determination of the Department of Education, equal or exceed in quality already existing programs of teacher education.

Objection: These recommendations concentrate on a single rather dubious means, *i.e.*, internships, of diversifying teacher education rather than on diverstification in teacher education as an end in itself. Further, the recommendations assume that teacher education consists only of methods, rather than theory, research and methods in that order, and advocate a return to a crafts or apprentice approach to teacher preparation. These recommendations could only result in a new conformity to replace the old and in the weakening of the quality teacher education programs which now exist.

Alternate Recommendations: a. All teacher education programs should be required to define the nature and type of field research experience required and to specify those criteria which would indicate that the objectives of field work had been achieved. Completion of these field experiences should be based on demonstration of competence rather than time served. b. Selected colleges and universities should be encouraged to develop special teacher education programs specifically tailored to the needs and background of those who already hold degrees in other fields from colleges or junior colleges and who express an interest in teaching. These programs must meet all Department of Education standards for program approval.

Signed:
Hugh F. McKeegan

Recommendations #6-4.2 and 6-4.3

Recommendations: Selected school districts, intermediate units or teacher centers that develop approved programs should sponsor an alternative type of internship. This would be for people who wish to enter teaching and possess a degree other than from an approved program and who have had no previous training. This internship would be for a minimum of two years. For approval, such a program should, in the determination of the Department of Education, equal or exceed in quality already existing programs of teacher education.

Both internship programs would be based on a system of graduated responsibility for teaching duties, and under the supervision of certified educators who have had specialized training in working with interns.

Objection: The content of the recommendations are contrary to the sentiments recently expressed by former Assistant Health, Education and Welfare Secretary for Education, Sidney P. Marland, in the Preface to part I of the report, *The Education Professions, 1971-1972.* When speaking about the excess of teachers, he states, "The first step toward correcting these education manpower imbalances is the development of a close collaboration between the colleges and universities which recruit and train teachers and the school systems which hire them."[1] The recommendations literally call for a divorce between Higher Education and Basic Education. At the same time, it is calling upon the public to duplicate teacher training resources at a time when we cannot afford this financially. In addition to dangers of localization and inbreeding of personnel, the proposed school internship system of teacher education excluding the colleges and uuiversities increases the possibility of favoritism, nepotism and political appointment. As parents of school-age children, professional educators and members of this committee, we cannot support this part of the report.

Signed:
B. Wayne Walker

Concurring:
Pauline M. Leet
Hugh F. McKeegan
Jeanette F. Reibman

Recommendation #6-6.0

Recommendation: The State Board of Education should eliminate Level II certificates for all school personnel and make the continued validity of the Level I certificate contingent upon participation in continuous in-service programs.

Objection: This recommendation removes another means of rewarding those teachers who have earned some professional recognition. Teachers should be encouraged to work toward Master's degrees—the Level II certificate provides such encouragement.

Alternate Recommendation: Level II certificates should be restricted to those teachers who hold earned Master's degrees. The Pennsylvania

[1] Sidney P. Marland, "USOE Study Criticizes College Grad Schools for Too Many Teachers," *Higher Education and National Affairs,* XXII, 18 (May 11, 1973), p. 6.

Department of Education and school districts should be encouraged to provide ranks with appropriate perquisites and responsibilities within the teaching profession.

Signed:
Hugh F. McKeegan

Concurring:
Paul S. Christman
William Potter
B. Wayne Walker

Recommendation #6-7.0

Recommendation: The Department of Education should continue to grant tenure following the completion of two years of satisfactory service in a school district, but administrators should recognize a clear responsibility to perform thorough evaluations.

Objection: This recommendation continues present inflexible practices and fails to recognize individual differences in teachers' professional development.

Alternate Recommendation: Local districts may exercise flexibility in granting tenure based on acceptable teaching performance at any time between the completion of the first semester's teaching and the beginning of the fourth year of teaching.

Signed:
Hugh F. McKeegan

Concurring:
Pauline M. Leet

Recommendation #6-9.0

Recommendation: The Department of Education should pursue, as a priority, the development of an administrators academy. Such an academy should be responsive to current problems and supplement pre-certification preparation programs.

Objection: Here again, the Commission advocates a specific, currently popular procedure rather than a general policy. A single approach to the in-service growth of school administrators, well-intentioned though it may be, will tend to contribute to further conformity rather than to innovativeness and divergence in thought and practice. Further, the role of the Commonwealth should be to establish standards and evaluate effectiveness of programs rather than to operate the programs themselves. Program operation should be left to such agencies as profes-

sional associations, colleges and universities, regionally constituted groups or some combination thereof.

Alternate Recommendation: The concept of ongoing in-service education for all administrators is endorsed. The administrator academy proposed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education as one approach to the problem should be fully defined, field-tested and evaluated with support from the legislature. The Pennsylvania Department of Education should also accept and field-test other proposals for meeting the in-service needs of administrators.

Signed:
Hugh F. McKeegan

Recommendation #6-10.0

Recommendation: Tenured teachers who successfully complete a program of administrative training, including a one-year internship, would, upon gaining certification, be given employment as full-time administrators and, satisfactorily completing the probationary period, lose their tenured status as teachers and be granted tenure as administrators.

Objection: The building principal is the key figure in educational change. We need a larger number of "risk takers" in these positions.

Alternate Recommendation: All administrators of the rank of principal or above who supervise teachers or are responsible for instructional organization and functioning should be appointed to limited terms, say four years, with the right of reappointment. There should be no tenure in the ordinary sense for administrators, but those who elect to accept the responsibility of an administrative position should be able to retain their tenure as teachers and should be able to return to teaching on request or at the termination of their administrative appointment.

Signed:
Hugh F. McKeegan

Concurring:
Jane S. Freedman
Pauline M. Leet

Recommendation #6-17.0

Recommendation: The State Board of Education should establish minimum criteria to be employed in teacher performance evaluation.

Objection: This recommendation confuses the primary role of the professional in determining the means by which objectives are attained

with the primary role of the lay person in determining questions of policy or ends in education. Criteria for judging professional performance cannot be effectively developed by majority vote. Again, statism rather than local diversity is promoted.

Alternate Recommendation: The Pennsylvania Department of Education should commission competent researchers in teacher education to develop several alternate systems for assessing teachers' performance in the classroom. These systems should then be reviewed by committees from individual districts and the system or systems most appropriate to the local district's educational philosophy and teaching priorities should be selected for local use.

Signed:
Hugh F. McKeegan

Concurring:
Pauline M. Leet

Chapter VII—Management

Recommendation #7-1.0

Recommendation: The teaching experience requirement for principals should be retained. Principals must be instructional leaders and not simply building managers.

Objection: The spirit of the recommendation is supported, but something must be done about the unnecessarily long period of professional service now required before the administrative certificate can be issued. Men and women are dissuaded from considering school administration as a career because of the five years professional service required *before* principals' certificates can be issued.

Alternate Recommendation: Status as a tenured teacher combined with successful completion of an approved program in administration shall be considered adequate classroom experience for the issuance of the principal's certificate.

Signed:
Hugh F. McKeegan

Concurring:
Jane S. Freedman
Pauline M. Leet
William R. Riekert
Louise Scholze

Recommendation #7-1.0

Recommendation: The teaching experience requirement for principals should be retained. Principals must be instructional leaders and not simply building managers.

Objection: In all other aspects of the education field, we have encouraged the involving of people from nontraditional backgrounds as potential resources for teaching, superintending, counseling or otherwise to assist school districts in providing the most capable talent for carrying out their functions. Only for the principal have we retained an uncompromising attitude, insisting that three years' teaching experience is a prerequisite for building principal, irrespectve of the other administrative skills which an individual might possess, and which are frequently more essential to effective leadership of a school. The notion of a principal as an instructional leader breaks down when he is managing a school in excess of 1,000 children. We have provided an exception for the superintendent of schools—even for the State Secretary of Education where the incumbent has proved to be exceptional in skill and talent.

Moreover, the current insistence on prior teaching experience has resulted in the school systems of this Commonwealth representing the "Peter Principle gone berserk." By requiring teaching as a prerequisite, we indicate to teachers that we reward both in status and in money, only the administrator. We thereby discourage teachers who are ambitious for both financial and professional reward from staying in their classrooms if they are talented and gifted teachers. No studies on administrative excellence have shown any correlation between excellence in teaching and excellence in administration: the skills are different.

In fact, the Commission has recognized this difference by recommending the creation of an Administrators Academy. If we retain the uniform requirement for principalship that there be a three year teaching stint, we are dooming some children somewhere to poor teaching by persons interested in administration, but less effective in the classroom.

Alternate Recommendation: Therefore, it is recommended that the teaching requirement for principalships be waivable at the option of the superintendent of the school district with the approval of the Secretary of Education, where proper training and/or experience in-

dicates the presence of the competencies necessary for fulfillment of the role of the principal.

Signed:
Miriam Gafni

Concurring:
Ruth Bennett
Jane S. Freedman
William Heyn
William Potter
William Riekert
Louise Scholze

Recommendation #7-25.0

Recommendation: The Governor should create a Commission to study the organization of the Pittsburgh and Philadelphia School Districts. The Commission should pay special attention to the possible impact of organizational units, relationships and functions on the general quality of education and on the related question of equality of educational opportunity.

Objection: It is completely impossible to reorganize school districts in these twin urban areas for proper racial balance, feasibility of management and more equitable tax bases, unless the surrounding suburban townships and counties are involved as potential participants in such reorganization. The side effects of attempts to maintain the integrity of racially or economically "pure" districts during the previous massive reorganization of school districts has resulted in civil rights litigation which will cause the segregated districts to be integrated, eventually.

Unfortunately, while the quest for bigger, more economical school districts was raging, no attention was placed on the other side of the spectrum, the overly large, unwieldy, and hence almost ungovernable, urban districts at either end of the Commonwealth. If this Commission is unwilling to ignore the current boundary lines which surround and isolate Philadelphia and Pittsburgh from their suburban neighbors in its proposed study for reorganization, it dooms these two communities to further racial and economic isolation.

Alternate Recommendation: Therefore, recommend that intensive plans for reorganization of both Pittsburgh and Philadelphia be undertaken to achieve a proper racial, ethnic and socio-economic mix of students, teachers and communities and with a proper division of the tax base,

without regard to current boundary lines, and in pursuit of regional reorganization of neighboring districts together with the two cities.

Signed:
Miriam Gafni

Concurring:
Ruth Bennett
Madge Benovitz
Jane Freedman
Ronald Huber
Pauline Leet
Louise Scholze

Chapter VIII—Governance

Recommendation #8-4.0

Recommendation: The Department of Education should develop a master plan for the education of the young child.

Objection: This recommendation places the Commission on record as favoring the concept of day care sponsored by local school taxes. The high cost of such programs ($3,000 or more per child) poses a question as to their practicality.

Signed:
William R. Riekert

Concurring:
Paul S. Christman
Donald W. Fox
William Heyn
Joseph M. Plevyak
William M. Potter

Recommendation #8-4.0

Recommendation: The Department of Education should develop a master plan for the education of the young child.

Objection: The recommendation does not give sufficient emphasis to the necessity of educating parents and future parents in child rearing, and to the critical roles of the home and parent-child contacts in the home environment during the early years.

Additional Recommendation: Strengthening the capability of parents and future parents to provide appropriate educational experiences for

their children should be a major objective of the Pennsylvania Department of Education plan. Further, the PDE should cooperate with other state agencies in the improvement of the home and family as the primary basis for early childhood education.

Signed:
Hugh F. McKeegan

Concurring:
Ruth Bennett
Miriam L. Gafni
H. Ronald Huber
Pauline M. Leet
Joseph M. Plevyak

Recommenadtion #8-5.0

Recommendation: The General Assembly should enact legislation requiring all school boards in the Commonwealth to be elected.

Objection: The recommendation would promote inflexibility rather than flexibility as it fails to recognize unique regional or local needs.

Alternate Recommendation: Subject to appropriate regulation by the legislature and State Board of Education, every school district in the Commonwealth should be permitted to develop systems of governance that will best meet unique local needs consonant with geographic size, population density, composition, etc. Thus, whether a board is appointed in whole or in part, elected in whole or in part, elected at large or by geographic area should be decided primarily at the local level with appropriate regulation by the state.

Signed:
Hugh F. McKeegan

Concurring:
Jane S. Freedman
B. Wayne Walker
Jeanette Riebman

Recommendation #8-5.0

Recommendation: The General Assembly should enact legislation requiring all school boards in the Commonwealth to be elected.

Objection: This position is totally inconsistent with the major thrust of this Commission to individualize and personalize the operation of schools and their systems to meet the needs both of students and their *communities.* There is no evidence that all communities in this Com-

monwealth desire or could benefit from a uniform method of selection of school directors. To the contrary, the rationale underlying the rejection of elected school boards in the two major cities of the Commonwealth continues to this day. The vast array of power controlling elections through the two party system will not guarantee any greater citizen representation or better quality school directors by the magic of placing their names on a ballot. In fact, the current trend in the judiciary is to remove judges from partisan politics, and eventually from the elective process altogether.

In Philadelphia, there is no greater guarantee that adequate minority representation would result from an elective process than that persons not interested in public education might be elected easily to such posts. In fact, where the population of a city is sharply polarized over the advisability of increasing support for public schools, it is conceivable that the elective process would enhance the voice of ethnic voting blocs who seek to reduce both support for and expansion of the programs of the public schools.

Those who see the elective process as a means of resolving the big cities' school fiscal crises completely miss the boat. First, education is a state constitutional responsibility and should be fully funded by the state. Secondly, in such diverse political communities, the electorate will resist increased taxes for schools as they have for city services. Finally, the tax base of such urban districts is so limited as to be incapable of wider expansion for local tax levying purposes for schools, unless: a graduated income tax is enacted, a progressive tax structure is afforded municipalities as well, and the Sterling Act is either repealed or the Commonwealth assumes major responsibility for alleviating certain forms of municipal overburden, *i.e.*, welfare, courts and prisons. Until that is accomplished, the General Assembly will have little relief from the consistent requests from major cities for increased school aid, even if their local school boards were elected and had the power to tax.

Alternate Recommendation: Local governments' push for home rule and different structures to meet different needs should be encouraged, not squelched. Thus, the Commission should recommend some form of local option for school board selection or election.

Signed:
Miriam Gafni

Recommendation #8-7.0

Recommendation: The State Board of Education should adopt a statewide student bill of rights and responsibilities with provision for implementation by local school boards.

Objection: More than civil rights and responsibilies is involved in any comprehensive statement of rights and responsibilities. The recommendation fails to recognize the wide diversity that exists in the Commonwealth and within regions of the Commonwealth on question of values, appropriate and inappropriate behavior, etc. The procedure suggested here is diametrically opposed to the Commission's interest in encouraging greater local involvement in schools.

Alternate Recommendation: The State Board of Education should adopt a policy regarding the development of statements of student rights and responsibilities in every school district in the Commonwealth. These statements should be developed by local groups consisting of students, teachers, parents, administrators and community representatives with assistance from the school solicitor. Parents or students aggrieved by any locally developed statement should have the right of appeal to the local board, the Secretary of Education and the State Board.

Signed:
Hugh F. McKeegan

Concurring:
Paul S. Christman
H. Ronald Huber
Pauline M. Leet

Recommendation #8-11.0

Recommendation: The General Assembly should enact legislation providing for educational receivership. This procedure would allow the Department of Education to supervise the development of an educational improvement program in a school district which ignores state law or State Board regulations or which, by poor continued performance, does not achieve the learning outcomes as prescribed by the state and local plan.

Objection: If needed improvements are state funded, then districts would be rewarded for noncompliance. If needed improvements are funded locally, then taxes would be levied by state-appointed, rather than locally-elected, officials. Neither situation is desirable.

Further, and perhaps more important, *receivership* appears to be too drastic a course for nonperformance. Alternate means should be sought to bring districts up to standards set by the Commonwealth.

Signed:
William R. Riekert

Concurring:
William C. Heyn
William Potter

Recommendation #8-15.0

Recommendation: The State Board of Education should require that all school board members have both preservice and in-service training.

Objection: The recommendation to *mandate* preservice and in-service training is impractical. A required course will not assure learning. There is no way to develop pass-fail standards and protect the autonomy of local elections. A well developed voluntary program should be encouraged.

Signed:
William R. Riekert

Concurring:
Paul S. Christman
Jane S. Freedman
H. Ronald Huber
Hugh F. McKeegan
William M. Potter

Recommendation #8-23.0

Recommendation: A school board should not vote upon an item that does not appear on the previously released agenda, except in the case of an unforeseen emergency.

Objection: This recommendation is cumbersome. It would result in continuous bickering or possible litigation regarding whether the topic on the agenda correctly depicted the action taken by the Board.

Signed:
William R. Riekert

Concurring:
Paul S. Christman
William C. Heyn
H. Ronald Huber
William M. Potter
B. Wayne Walker

Appointment of Secretary of Education

Objection: Under "Agencies at the State Level," no proposals are made regarding the position of Secretary of Education or the State Board of Education. It is critical that there be a succession of innovative and imaginative leaders in these positions if efforts at educational improvement are to be sustained over an extended period.

Recommendation: The Secretary of Education should be appointed by the Governor from a list of candidates recommended by the State Board of Education and should serve a single six-year term. To be considered, all candidates for this position should submit a plan to the State Board, with priorities and rationale therefore, for the improvement of education in the Commonwealth and evidence that they have the administrative and educational competence to implement the plan *if* appointed to the position.

Signed:
Hugh F. McKeegan

Concurring:
William Heyn
H. Ronald Huber
Pauline M. Leet

Role of the State Board of Education

The Governance chapter gives insufficient emphasis to the role and responsibility of the State Board of Education in providing quality education throughout the Commonwealth. Now in the tenth year of operation, the Board has accomplished much to make Pennsylvania education more effective and efficient. The following recommendations are made to further strengthen the State Board in implementing the recommendations of the Citizens Commission.

a. The Board should take a much more active role in initiating public discussion of educational issues and possible new policy directions for the Commonwealth. This will require monthly meetings, regular public hearings and additional publicity regarding the Board's agenda and activities. In view of the additional time that these responsibilities will require and to assure that members will not be unduly penalized financially because of their willingness to serve, consideration should be given to some form of compensation, salary or per diem, in addition to expenses, for the time involved in Board service.

b. The Board should have its own staff with particular competence in long-range planning, interpretation of educational research, and evaluation of educational programs. This staff should be kept small and should have no responsibility for administering programs established to carry out Board policies. Its principal function should be to assist the Board in policy determination through providing or securing assessments of the effects of various proposed policies which the Board is considering and to do research regarding emerging issues which the Board may wish to consider.

c. In making appointments to the Board, consideration should be given to making the Board as representative as possible of the interests and backgrounds of the citizens of the Commonwealth.

Signed:
Hugh F. McKeegan

Concurring:
Ruth Bennett
Madge Benovitz
Paul S. Christman

Chapter IX—Supportive Services

Recommendations #9-20.0 and 9-20.1

Recommendations: As a part of its service function, the intermediate unit should assume the responsibility for organizing and sponsoring programs to provide a continuous updating of the profession.

School Administrators' Memorandum No. 557, which establishes guidelines for approval of in-service programs, should be the model for the intermediate unit.

Objection: Both of these recommendations illustrate a weakness that is evident in several parts of the report; a concentration on means rather than ends and on conformity with one approach rather than experimental trial of a number of approaches. Certainly intermediate units should be one vehicle for providing in-service education. Whether they should assume responsibility to the extent implied in these and succeeding recommendations is debatable. The Commission received no data to indicate that the *typical* intermediate unit now has the staff and other resources to organize and carry out in-service programs of the variety and quality needed. The Commonwealth would benefit from competition among a variety of in-service approaches conducted by school districts, colleges, universities, intermediate units and private agencies, both profit and nonprofit.

Alternate Recommendations:

a. An immediate and comprehensive study should be conducted to determine what resources the intermediate units need in terms of staff, dollars and materials to conduct effective in-service programs;
b. As a concomitant to the study recommended above, an independent outside agency should evaluate an adequate sample of in-service programs being conducted under the provisions of

School Administrators' Memorandum No. 557 in order to determine their quality, comprehensiveness and effect; and

c. The Pennsylvania Department of Education should support the development, field-testing and evaluation of a variety of plans to provide for the in-service education of teachers and administrators.

Signed:
Hugh F. McKeegan

The Role of Educational Television

Objection: The report on Supportive Services is silent on the development of educational television and its role, particularly in adult and community education. The considerable state investment in broadcasting equipment, transmission systems, etc., is jeopardized by inadequate funding to support high quality programming for in-school and home use.

Recommendation: The present state system of educational television stations and regional broadcasting councils should be given particular responsibility for community service and adult education programs. Stations and councils should be supported through assessments based on the total resident population of each school district rather than through per pupil assessments.

Signed:
Hugh F. McKeegan

Concurring:
Ruth V. Bennett
Paul S. Christman
Jane S. Freedman
Miriam L. Gafni
H. Ronald Huber
Edward T. Hughes

Chapter X—Finance

Graduated Income Tax

The Finance chapter does not address itself to the realities of financing education. The Commission, in its deliberations, concerned itself only with existing, regressive means of taxation. In order to implement the recommendations contained in this report, a restructured system of educational financing is needed. The additional expenditures, which would of necessity result from the Commission's recommendations, can-

not truly be implemented unless properly financed. This, coupled with the current inflationary spiral, requires that an equitable and flexible system of taxation be adopted by the Commonwealth. Therefore, it is recommended that the Commission urge the General Assembly to pass a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the Commonwealth to permit a graduated income tax.

Signed:
Madge Benovitz

Concurring:
Ruth Bennett
Peter Buttenweiser
Paul Christman
Jane Freedman
Miriam Gafni
Richard Gilmore
John Hershey
Ronald Huber
Pauline Leet
Hugh McKeegan
Joseph Plevyak
Jeanette Reibman
James H. Rowland, Sr.
Louise Scholze

Funding of Special Education

The Finance chapter made no reference to the funding of special education. We recommend the full assumption by the Commonwealth of the responsibility to fund on a current and complete basis all costs incurred for the education of the physically handicapped, the mentally retarded, the emotionally disturbed, the learning disabled and the gifted. All of these children present special learning problems and they are all entitled to have their educational needs met by the Commonwealth. Special education has been described to cover all of these classes of children. Today, the state currently funds all the costs for such children over and above the normal per pupil expenditure of a school district. But, because there is a court order requiring the acceptance of all retarded children into the public school system, greater emphasis has been placed on meeting the needs of those children than on any other group.

Many school administrators have been slow to meet the legitimate needs of these retarded children as well as the other "special ed" children because of inadequate start-up costs financed from local sources. These

suits were consented to by the Commonwealth, and properly so. The response must be from the Commonwealth. The long term benefits to society of well-educated, functioning adults who can live and work, integrated with the rest of society, is a tremendous resource for the entire Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, not merely for the local school district in which that child may reside. The same talent which is nurtured as a "gift" will redound to the entire Commonwealth. Accordingly, all the costs for educating all of these "special" children should be fully funded by the Commonwealth, particularly, since it is well-recognized that the costs of such programs are significantly above average and also entail special facilities, additional personnel and frequently, special transportation needs. The design of curriculum and special learning materials, as well as research into the best methods of effectively reaching such children also require funds.

The Commonwealth has gone part way toward accomplishing this goal. It is incumbent upon the Commission to recommend that the Commonwealth complete the program and fully finance on a current basis all special education programs in the Commonwealth.

Signed:
Miriam Gafni

Concurring:
Ruth Bennett
Madge Benovitz
Paul Christman
Richard Gilmore
William Heyn
Ronald Huber
Pauline Leet
Joseph Plevyak
Louise Scholze
Bernard Watson

Funding of Capital Construction

The Finance chapter makes no reference to the proper funding of capital construction.

In the last few years, great concern has been expressed by citizens throughout this Commonwealth about the high cost of capital construction for school buildings and the fact that some school boards have used school buildings as a way of honoring themselves with glorious "Taj Mahals" at great public expense. This concern culminated last year in the passage of a "Taj Mahal" bill which restricts the funding of schools in all districts of the Commonwealth, except for Philadelphia

and Pittsburgh. Many citizens have opposed this bill as being an inappropriate solution to a serious problem.

What remains unresolved is the difficulty of providing adequate necessary school facilities for children throughout the Commonwealth, without regard to the willingness of their local citizens to approve a bond issue. With the vast recommendations made by the Commission concerning individualizing instruction and reducing the size of school units, facilities will need to be upgraded. In some instances, new ones will have to be built to accommodate the new instructional designs.

Debt service is increasingly a larger portion of the average school district operating budget. This is true, both in cities where population shifts and the presence of many non fire-resistant buildings pose health and safety hazards, and in suburban communities where major new developments have created new school populations overnight. As inflation continues to escalate building costs, school districts should be able to look to the Commonwealth for relief from the current high interest rates which accompany bond issues.

Despite the fact that there are minimum standards, abnormal costs for school buildings cannot be controlled by the Bureau of Construction. Even the "Taj Mahal" bill will not prevent this conspicuous consumption, if the tax payers are willing to bear a larger share of the cost locally and affirm the proposal in referendum.

Thus, the capital facilities program may effectively thwart attempts by this Commission to equalize educational opportunity throughout the Commonwealth, when neighboring districts can have totally unequal physical facilities for their children solely because of local district wealth. Many states, including Maryland and Florida, have undertaken a full state financing of all capital programs for school districts, assuming all debt service in the current budgets and using various devices, including a state building authority to regulate and control costs related to financing and construction charges.

In Pennsylvania, there already is a Public School Building Authority with extensive experience in this area. It would not be a complicated process to transfer all school construction to that Authority, subject to Bureau of Construction approval and with full payment to be made by the General Assembly. Then, if a school facility were no longer needed as a school in the future, it would be a simple matter for its use to be converted by the Commonwealth to some more appropriate function of State Government; facilities might more easily have dual purposes while they were still functioning as schools. It would also be easier for the Commonwealth to make available a wider variety of educational programs across district lines. The facilities could be built and admin-

istered through an intermediate unit for vocational technical skills, or career education centers or schools, or aviation electronic schools, or the like.

Also, by using a statewide authority to build schools throughout the Commonwealth, the disproportionately high and low costs of school construction could be spread more evenly throughout the Commonwealth. This would reduce the uneven burden on one group of taxpayers as compared to another.

Therefore, we recommend the full state financing of the capital program of all school districts in the Commonwealth, the assumption of all debt service connected with capital facilities, and the implementation of this program through the Public School Building Authority in conjunction with the Bureau of Construction of the Department of Education and the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission.

Signed:
Miriam Gafni

Concurring:
Ruth Bennett
Madge Benovitz
Paul Christman
Richard Gilmore
William Heyn
Ronald Huber
Pauline Leet
Louise Scholze
Bernard Watson

Dissent to the Recommendations on School Finance

This is a dissent to the chapter on Finance because it fails to recognize the fundamental responsibility of the General Assembly, as charged by the Constitution with the responsibility of providing for the "maintenance and support of a thorough and efficient system of public education." A realistic cost basis should be established by the Department of Education for a *basic* educational program. This cost basis should be adjusted by districts to reflect non-normal factors such as concentrations of poverty families and differentials in living costs. Upon approval of such a realistic cost basis for a basic program, the Commonwealth should guarantee that amount of money for each school district necessary to fund the basic program. This money would come in part from the real estate tax now levied by school districts and in part from present and future sources of state revenues. It would not, however, prohibit local school districts from raising their own funds from real

estate taxes or other local tax sources to fund school programs for their own districts beyond the basic funding level provided by the Commonwealth.

Signed:

Donald Rappaport

Dissent to the Recommendations on School Finance

Possibly no more difficult task faced the Commission than that of grappling with the complexities of school finance. Many months were spent deliberating whether to recommend full state funding of public elementary and secondary education or to recommend retention of the present system with minor modifications.

While the Commission's recommendations to modify the present system have merit as being essential to provide some degree of early relief to obvious flaws in the subsidy formula, they should not be viewed as resolving fundamental problems of financing public education in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Those joining in this dissent were out-voted (10-9, 1 abstention) in the effort to have the Commission recommend that the Commonwealth assume full responsibility for raising and distributing the revenues for public elementary and secondary education, and that the shift eliminating local responsibility for raising and distributing revenues for public education be accomplished over a time period of five to eight years. Accordingly, the recommended modifications to the present formula are acceptable as interim relief—a temporary expedient.

Specifically, then, this minority report is a dissent to the Commission's recommendation that "the State Board of Education undertake a study of all the ramifications of full state funding of public elementary-secondary education." The recommendation may be a tacit suggestion as to what the Commonwealth ought to do to fund public education but avoids any commitment as to when.

There have been many studies of school finance over the last few years—President's Commission on School Finance, National Education Finance Project, and the Fleischman Commission (N. Y.), just to name a few. Commission members familiar with these studies are aware of, and agree with, the common conclusion that full state funding appears to be the most appropriate financing model if, within a state, public education is to be made *equally accessible to all children* and if the *costs related thereto are to be borne equitably by all citizens.*

Some of the most cogent rationale for full state funding can be found among the recommendations of the National Legislative Conference

(pp. 196-201, Issues in School Finance, Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, United States Senate):

1. Money alone will not cure all the ills of our public education system, but no improvements can be made until the manner in which educational funds are raised and distributed is altered.

2. Evidence clearly shows that the manner by which local property taxes are levied for financing public education favors wealthy localities with a large non-residential tax base and penalizes those jurisdictions with a small non-residential base.

   The states, in fulfilling their responsibility in the area of educational finance, should move toward stabilization of and, where possible, a reduction in their reliance on the local property tax as a revenue source for public education.

   States which continue to use the property tax as a source of educational revenue should initiate a review and, where necessary, reformation of their property tax administration. Specifically, the states are urged to adopt a uniform system of assessment to assure an equalized property tax burden.

   Furthermore, the method of taxation used to supplement or supplant the property tax base should have a growth factor comparable to the increase of educational costs.

3. Local, non-educational public services are financed largely from the property tax, and although the central cities tend to have a relatively large property tax base, the total burden placed upon their tax base usually is heavier than it is in areas where the demand for such public services as sewage maintenance, street lighting, fire and police protection is low.

   In the attempt to equalize the costs of maintaining schools, states are urged to recognize those non-educational expenses, for example, municipal overburden, which affect local tax burdens.

4. An equal educational opportunity implies an equalization of educational resources among school districts. In order to equalize resources among districts, two alternatives are available: (1) reduce education funds from some districts to raise the resource level for others, or (2) provide substantially increased funds to raise the poorer districts' resources up to a level enjoyed by the more affluent districts. The latter is obviously preferable.

   No school district should be compelled to reduce its level of expenditure while a state moves toward assuming its full role in financing and distributing educational funds.

The equalization level is a matter to be determined by each state. However, it is recommended that the 65th percentile level of per-pupil expenditures be the minimum standard guaranteed by each state.

5. Equality does not mean identical treatment. The crucial value to be fostered by a system of public education is the opportunity to succeed, not the uniformity of success. While all are equal under the law, nature and other circumstances yield advantages to some, while handicapping others. Hence, as the President's Commission suggested: "To offer children only equal education, disregarding differences in their circumstances is merely to maintain or perhaps even to magnify the relative effects of advantage and handicap. Equal treatment of unequals does not produce equality."

   A concept of equal educational opportunity should reflect a sensitivity to the differences in costs and variations in interests and needs of those to be educated. Attempts at relieving disparities by attending to particular educational needs and variations in costs will prove fruitless, however, unless those needs and costs can be clearly identified and fully quantified.

6. The argument is made that a greater assumption of school financing responsibilities by the state will undermine, or perhaps even destroy, the tradition of local control of education. We believe that local control is not dependent on local tax raising ability. Local school districts are the creation of and responsibility of the state. Their authority to raise funds for education comes as a result of delegation by the state of its own taxing authority.

   There is a distinction between local fiscal control and local control over policy. Local fiscal control is no longer a possibility if financial discrimination is to be terminated in public education. Insistence upon financial control over education by the state in order to eliminate discrimination to taxpayers and students in no way has to interfere with continued administrative and policy control of the schools by the local districts. On the contrary, the new standard of school finance encouraged by [the] *Serrano* [case] suggests that for the first time poor school districts will enjoy significant local control over educational policy, which the lack of resources have previously made impossible.

   Evidence fails to demonstrate any correlation between an increase in the state assumption of educational costs and loss of local decision-making authority. If anything, the evidence suggests that local decision-making power to shape the content of

local educational programs is enhanced once local boards are freed of the burden of searching for essential financial resources. Regardless of how the states decide to finance their system of public education, they can and should leave policy decisions and administrative control in the hands of local districts. It is the state's obligation to insure that a basic educational package is delivered to all children on an equalized basis; it should be the local district's prerogative to determine how that package will be delivered.

7. At least 75 percent of current operating expenditures in education go into teachers' salaries and salaries of other employees. Because of the fiscal magnitude of this portion of educational costs, increased state responsibility in this area will be necessary. The National Legislative Conference recommends that as an essential corollary to state assumption of the fiscal responsibility for public education, the state should play a larger role in the determination of teacher salary schedules.

Those endorsing this minority report wish to affirm their support for consideration of a graduated income tax as an additional source of revenue to support public education. Real estate taxes produce about 40 per cent of the funds supporting public education in Pennsylvania. As the Commission report indicates, this source is too significant in magnitude to be abandoned. However, some relief is necessary, at least to avoid further upward pressure on real estate taxes.

A graduated income tax would relieve the pressure on property taxes and provide needed yield growth hopefully commensurate with reasonable growth in educational expenditures.

Signed:

Richard Gilmore

Concurring:

Ruth V. Bennett
Madge Benovitz
Harry Block
Peter Buttenweiser
Paul S. Christman
Jane S. Freedman
Miriam Gafni
Emmanuel J. George
Victoria Johnson
Pauline Leet
Jeanette F. Reibman
Louise Scholze
Bernard C. Watson

GLOSSARY

Accountability. The obligation of educators to identify the goals of the educational enterprise, and the nature and effectiveness of public resources applied toward these goals.

Curriculum. The related facts, concepts, skills, attitudes and values which the school formally endorses as necessary and/or valuable for membership in society.

Hidden Curriculum. The informal, unintended "curriculum." That is, the facts, concepts, skills, attitudes and values which students learn by the school's example.

Time-based/Subject-oriented Curriculum. A curriculum which qualifies students for graduation on the basis of progression through predetermined units of time and divisions of knowledge.

Intended Learning Outcomes Curriculum. A curriculum which qualifies students for graduation on the basis of their ability to demonstrate competence in those facts, concepts, skills, attitudes, and values endorsed by the school.

Educational Technology. The purposeful allocation and organization of human and non-human resources to meet educational goals.

Evaluation. The periodic assessment of the appropriateness and effectiveness of educational programs by educators and citizens.

Process Evaluation. The periodic assessment of the appropriateness of the means the school uses to assist students to achieve curricular goals (Instruction).

Product Evaluation. The periodic assessment of student achievement of intended learning outcomes and the appropriateness of those intended outcomes.

Full State Funding. A method of financing public education in which the state collects and disburses all necessary funds. This method eliminates local financing of schools.

Governance. The political function of setting educational goals and policies.

Intended Learning Outcomes. See Curriculum.

Instruction. The organized means the school uses to assist students in achieving curricular goals.

Management. The direction and coordination of human and non-human resources.

Nongraded School. A school with an educational program which eliminates age grouping as the primary method for organizing instruction. In place of the traditional grade designations, learning groups are established on the basis of individual needs and learning styles. Under this approach, students are frequently reassigned to permit continuous progress toward the achievement of intended learning outcomes.

Schooling Process. That part of the education process which is associated with enrollment in a formal program of instruction in an institution designated as a school (not to be confused with the learning process which is lifelong and which can occur anywhere).

Planning. The systematic process of identifying and anticipating future educational needs and problems, and the development of effective strategies for the deployment of human and non-human resources to meet these needs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Academic Freedom in the Secondary Schools. New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1963.

Alternative Programs for Financing Education. Gainesville, Florida: National Educational Finance Project, 1971.

Anderson, James G. *Bureaucracy in Education.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1968.

"Approval of In-Service Activities for Certification Credit." *School Administrators Memorandum 557.* Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Department of Education, October 23, 1972.

Averch, Harvey A. *et al. How Effective is Schooling? A Critical Review and Synthesis of Research Findings.* Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, 1972.

Benne, Kenneth. "Authority in Education," *Harvard Educational Review.* Vol. 40, No. 3: August, 1970.

Coleman, James S., *et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity.* Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Combs, Arthur W. *Educational Accountability: Beyond Behavioral Objectives.* Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1972.

Commission Report: New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost, and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education. Vols. I-III. Albany: The University of the State of New York. The State Education Department, 1972.

Cremin, Lawrence A. *The Transformation of the School.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Davies, Ruth Ann. *The School Library: A Force for Educational Excellence.* New York: R. R. Bowker Company, 1969.

DeAngelis, Joseph B. *Survey of the Impact of the School District Reorganization Act of 1963 (Act 299) Upon Selected Elementary Schools of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.* Edinboro, Pennsylvania: Educational Development Center, Edinboro State College, 1972.

Drucker, Peter F. *The Effective Executive.* New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

———. *Technology, Management and Society.* New York: Harper and Row, 1970.

Dykes, Archie. "The Emergent Role of Administrators and the Implications for Teacher-Administrator Relationships," *ERIC Report.* ED 011 700: 1966.

Epstein, Charlotte. *Intergroup Relations for the Classroom Teacher.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1968.

Fantini, Mario D. *et al. Community Control and the Urban School.* New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Featherstone, Joseph. *Schools Where Children Learn.* New York: Liveright, 1971.

The Final Report of the Committee on Education—Appointed by Governor David L. Lawrence. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, April, 1961.

"Financing Public School Education in Pennsylvania," an Appendix to *The 1970 Subsidy Study of the State Board of Education of Pennsylvania.* Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: State Board of Education of Pennsylvania, 1970.

Future Directions for School Financing: A Response to Demands for Fiscal Equity in American Education. Gainesville, Florida: National Educational Finance Project, 1971.

Future Directions for School Financing: Summary Report. Gainesville, Florida: National Educational Finance Project, 1971.

Galbraith, John K. *The New Industrial State.* 2nd Edition. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1971.

Gattegno, Caleb. *What We Owe Children: The Subordination of Teaching to Learning.* New York: Outerbridge and Dienstfrey, 1970.

Gibb, J. R. "Expanding Role of the Administrators." *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 51.* May, 1967.

Glasser, William. *Schools Without Failure.* New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Glatthorn, A. S. *Students, Schools, and the Tides of Change.* New London, Connecticut: Croft Educational Services, 1970.

Goodlad, John I. and Robert H. Anderson. *The Non-Graded Elementary School.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962.

Goodman, Paul. *Compulsory Miseducation and the Community of Scholars.* New York: Vintage Books, 1962.

Gould, Samuel B. "Prologue: Prospects for Non-Traditional Study," in *Explorations in Non-Traditional Study.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

Green, Thomas F. "Schools and Communities: A Look Forward," *Harvard Educational Review.* Vol. 39, No. 2: Spring, 1969.

Guidelines for Program Development, Employment and Utilization of Educational Paraprofessionals. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1972.

Heath, Douglas. "Educational Wonderland: Myth or Reality," *Chicago Review*. Summer, 1973.

————. *Humanizing Schools: New Directions, New Decisions.* New York: Hayden Book Company, Inc., 1971.

Holt, John. *How Children Fail.* New York: Pitman, 1964.

————. *What Do I Do Monday?* New York: Dutton, 1970.

Hutchins, Robert M. "The Schools Must Stay," *The Center Magazine.* January-February, 1973.

Kozol, Jonathan. *Death at an Early Age.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1967.

"Ideas to Cut Costs: Individual School Nurses—Save 50%," *Nation's Schools.* Vol. 90, No. 2: August, 1972.

Illich, Ivan. *Deschooling Society.* New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Improving Education in Florida. Tallahassee, Florida: Governor's Citizens Committee on Education, 1973.

Johnson, Mauritz, Jr. *American Secondary Schools.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1965.

————. "Definitions and Models in Curriculum Theory," *Educational Theory.* Vol. 17: April, 1967.

Maslow, A. H. *Toward a Psychology of Being.* Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1962.

Morphet, Edgar L., David L. Jesser, and Arthur P. Ludka. *Planning and Providing for Excellence in Education.* Denver, Colorado: Department of Education, 1971.

Parsons, John M. "Ohio's System of Regional Coordinators for Pupil Transportation," *Journal of State School Systems Development.* Vol. 1, No. 2: Summer, 1967.

Policies, Procedures and Standards for Certification of Professional School Personnel. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1972.

"Public School Financial Statistics Report for School Years Ending 1963-1972," *Our Schools Today.* Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1972.

Report on Performance Based Certification of School Personnel. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida Department of Education, 1971.

Report of the White House Conference on Youth; April 18-22, 1971. Estes Park, Colorado. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Rogers, Carl R. *Freedom to Learn.* Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1969.

Sarason, Seymour B. *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change.* New Jersey: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

School Administrator's Handbook. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1972.

School Library Standards. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1972.

Schools, People, and Money; The Need for Educational Reform: Final Report. Washington, D. C.: President's Commission on School Finance, 1972.

Sexism in Education: Joint Task Force Report. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1972.

Sexton, Patricia Cayo. *Education and Income: Inequality of Opportunity in our Public Schools.* New York: Viking Press, 1961.

Silberman, Charles E. *Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education.* New York: Random House, 1970.

Sixth Report of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education; Counseling and Guidance: A Call for Change. Washington, D. C.: National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, June, 1972.

Skinner, B. F. *The Technology of Teaching.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.

Smith, Hyruna M. and Louise O. Eckerson. *Guidance Services in Elementary Schools.* Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1966.

Teacher Tenure Ain't the Problem. Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1973.

Vermont Design for Education. Montpelier, Vermont: State Department of Education, n. d.

Whitehead, Alfred North. *The Aims of Education.* New York: The Free Press, 1967.

INDEX

Page No.

Academic Freedom 64
Accountability 5, 79-80, 93, 96, 98-108
  and Curriculum 19-20, 25
  Defined 98
Administrators 2, 66-69, 94, 120
  Administration, General 4, 118, 133
  and Learning Outcomes 24
  as Agents of Change 6, 77
  Evaluation of 72-76
  Traits of Good Administrators 77-79, 81-82, 90-91
Alternate Schools and Programs 12, 16, 28-29, 152-153, 157
  see also *Schools-within-Schools*
Athletic Programs 29-31
Attendance
  Entry Age 48-49
  Exit Certificate 4, 49-50
  Length of School Year and Day 4, 50-51
  Removal of Children from School 49-49
  Required Twelve Years 4
  Student Leave Program 51-52
Ayala vs *Philadelphia Board of Public Education* 86
Bilingual Programs 11
Career and Vocational Education 10, 11-12, 25, 29, 123, 125
  see also *Counselors*
Certification 4, 58-64, 66-68, 69-70, 124
  Program Approval 59-60, 102-103
  Use of Noncertified Personnel 121, 124, 126, 127-128
Change Process 5-7, 45-46, 55-56, 76
  Fads 28, 44
Collective Bargaining 81-82, 135-136, 153-156
Community 5, 36-38, 63, 84-85, 109-115, 125-128
  and Learning Outcomes 26
  Citizens Advisory Councils 113-114
Competencies
  for Students 20-25
  for Teachers and Administrators 61-63, 67-68, 69-70
Computers 88
Consumerism 62
Counselors 121-125
  Differentiated Staffing 124

Page No.

Curriculum 15-33
Defined 20
Hidden Curriculum 18-19, 56
Time-based/subject-oriented 19
Drugs 62
Due Process 93
Early Childhood Education 107-108
Educational Planning 5, 18, 72, 87-88
and Intermediate Units 132
Department of Education 87, 99
Local 27-28
Long Range 18, 26, 105-106
Educational Technology 44-45
Equal Educational Opportunity 4-5, 9-12, 58, 83-84, 93, 125
Equal Employment Opportunity 4-5, 57-58
see also *Sexism, Intergration, Minorities*
Evaluation
Educational Quality Assessment 89
of Districts 89, 103-105
of Schools 27-28
of Teachers and Administrators 72-76, 80-81
Process and Product 104
Federal Aid to Education 136-138
Categorical vs General Funds 137-138
Revenue Sharing 136-137
Finance 135-158
Aid Ratio 140-143
and Nongradedness 146-147
Current Level 135
Delayed State Funding 146
Federal-State-Local 135, 138
Incentive Subsidies 152-153
Income Tax 152
Local Revenue 138-139
Special Cost Factors 143, 147-148
State Revenue 139-143
Flexible and Personalized Education ..... *passim*, 3-7
Full State Funding 149-150
Grouping 41-42
and Labeling 11-12
Standarized Tests 42

Page No.

Health Services 128-129
Incentive Grants 152-153
In-service Education 63-64, 132-133
Institutionalized Youth and Adults 106-107
Integration 10, 57
  and Busing 131
Intended Learning Outcomes 20-26
  Categories 24-25
  Examples 21
Intermediate Units 132-133
Internships 60-61, 67-68
Interpersonal and Intergroup Relations 62-63
Library and Media Services 119-121
Management 77-91
  Defined 78
  School Management Appraisal and Rating Techniques 80
Merit Pay 81, 156
Minorities (Racial and Ethnic) 10-11, 57, 120, 121, 130-131
Nongradedness 40-42
Organization for Instruction 33-54
  Defined 35
Paraprofessionals 70-71
  and Volunteers 125-128
Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children (PARC) Decision. 134
Pennsylvania Department of Education 93-116
  and Learning Outcomes 25-26
  Educational Receivership 105
  Staff 156-157
Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission 131
Physical Facilities 84-87
  Climate Control 86
  Insurance 87
Preservice Education 58-63, 66-68
Principals 80
  Head Teachers 83
  Role in Evaluation 80
Professional Employe
  Defined 56-57
Property Tax 136
  Assessment 143-145
Psychiatric Services 129

Page No.

Public Education
History in Pennsylvania 1-2
Public-Nonpublic Relationships 12-13
Public School Code of 1949
Need for Recodification 98
Reorganization 90
Robinson vs *Cahill* 149
Rodriguez vs *San Antonio* 149
School Boards 94-96, 99-101
and Learning Outcomes 24, 27
Composition of 100-101
Election of 99-100
Employment Practices 79-84
Meetings 112-113
Secretaries of, and Business Managers 82-83
Solicitors 109
Training of 108
School Governance 93-116
Defined 93
Schooling Process, the Limits of 3
School Size 52-53
Schools-within-Schools 53
Serrano vs *Priest* 149
Sex Education 62
Sexism 10, 11, 30, 83-84, 121, 125
in Athletic Programs 30
Joint Task Force on Sexism in Education 125
Social Work Services 128-129
Staffing 55-76
Defined 55
State Board of Education
and Learning Outcomes 24-26
Role in Evaluation 73
Students
Problems Identified 35-36
Rights and Responsibilities 101-102
Teaching Each Other 39
Superintendent 70, 80-81
Role in Evaluation 80
Waiving Requirements for 70

Page No.
Teachers 58-66
as Facilitators of Learning 40-41
Ten Goals of Quality Education
Listed 22-23
Tenure 64-66, 68-69
Transportation Services 130-131
Values, the Teaching of 15-17
Year-Round Use of Schools 43, 85

In Memory of

RAYMOND B. WITTIG

The Citizens Commission on Basic Education wishes to make special recognition of the contributions of Raymond B. Wittig. From his appointment to the Commission until his death, April 25, 1973, Mr. Wittig served the Commission with the same deep interest in education which characterized his entire life. The Citizens Commission and the Commonwealth will long remember his devotion and service.